

**Sculpture in the City and the Cemetery: The Formation of Political
Identities in Paris and Père Lachaise 1804-1853**

Nadine A. Pantano

PhD Thesis, History of Art

University College London

1998

VOL 1

Abstract

During the first half of the Nineteenth Century the dynamic of public commemoration was largely played out in the Parisian cemetery rather than in the capital. Particularly at Père Lachaise, most of the social and political changes of the capital below were mirrored and to a certain degree, the political identities of the living were actively being formulated through the erection of monuments. The purpose of this work is to illustrate, through a number of examples, that dynamic between city and cemetery.

Late eighteenth-century legislation and debates evolved to allow a variety of socio-political groups the opportunity of carving out their own spheres of identity and status in the cemetery. Like ideas about death and religious beliefs, previously used as the basis for a collective analysis of funeral monuments, this establishment of socio-economic and political identities may be perceived as a unifying function for a seemingly disparate group of monuments.

During the Restoration, Parisian monuments dedicated to Louis XVI, urban and religious in nature, functioned in direct contrast to the essentially secular, extra-mural and relatively democratic space of Père Lachaise promoting the cemetery as a space for political oppositional groups to identify themselves, illustrated by the monument to the liberal opposition leader General Foy and the tombs of a growing military enclave. Nonetheless the cemetery was also used for the presentation of official identities, illustrated by the monument to Prime Minister Périer, whose iconography can be linked to July Monarchy ideology through comparisons with official Parisian public sculpture. Even more encompassing aspects of identity and appurtenance were reflected in the rising bourgeoisie's establishment of imposing family mausoleums.

Table of Contents

Title Page, Page 1

Abstract, Page 2

Table of Contents, Page 3

List of Illustrations, Pages 4-23

Introduction, Pages 24-37

Chapter One: Defining the Nature of Commemoration in the Cemetery: Government Control vs. Individual Freedom. Pages 38-72

Chapter Two: Separate Spaces, Separate Identities: Defining the *Grand Homme* at Père Lachaise, Pages 73-121

Chapter Three: Reappropriating Commemorative Practices: The Bourbon Restoration and the Apotheosis of Louis XVI, Pages 122-169

Chapter Four: Liberal Politics and the Parisian Cemetery: David d'Angers and Léon Vaudoyer's *Monument to General Foy*, 1825-1831, Pages 170-210

Chapter Five: The *Monument to Casimir Périer*, 1832-1837: Finding the '*Juste Milieu*' for Orleanist Propaganda, Pages 211-244

Chapter Six: *Le Camp des Braves*: The Formation of a Military and Naval Enclave at Père Lachaise, Pages 245-300

Chapter Seven: Death in the Family: Bourgeois Family Tombs at Père Lachaise, Pages 300-334

Conclusion, Pages 334A - 334E

List of Illustrations, Pages 335-461

Bibliography, Pages 462-481

Maps 1 and 2 (Unbound)

List of Illustrations

1. Frederic Nash, *View of Paris from the Père Lachaise*, c.1820, engraving, Author's collection
2. Civeton, *Paris from the escarpment of the Père Lachaise*, c. 1829, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Estampes
3. Hubert Robert, *Garden Elysium of the Museum of French Monuments*, 1803, Oil on canvas, Musée Carnavalet, Paris
4. *Jardin Elysée, Vue du Tombeau de Molière*, engraving from Alexandre Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, Plate 199
5. *Jardin Elysée, Vue du Tombeau de Jean de Lafontaine*, engraving from Alexandre Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, Plate 200
6. *Jardin Elysée, Vue du Tombeau de Descartes*, engraving from Alexandre Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, Plate 197
7. *Jardin Elysée, Vue du Tombeau de Montfaucon*, engraving from Alexandre Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, Plate 202
8. J. Nash, *Monument d'Abélard et d'Héloïse, Père Lachaise*, engraving, Author's collection

9. *Jardin Elysée, Urne sepulchrale de Nicolas Boileau*, engraving from Alexandre Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, Plate 203
10. Molinos, *Champ de Repos*, from Cambry, *Rapport sur les sépultures*, Paris, year VII, Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris
11. Gasse, *Élévation et coupe du cimetière*, illustrated in *Grands Prix d'architecture: Projets couronnés par l'Académie d'architecture et par l'Institut de France*, Allais, Détournelle et Vaudoyer engravers and eds., Paris, 1806, Plate 63
12. Guignet, *Coupe et élévation de l'Élysée ou Cimetière public*, illustrated in *Grands Prix d'architecture: Projets couronnés par l'Académie d'architecture et par l'Institut de France*, Allais, Détournelle et Vaudoyer engravers and eds., Paris, 1806, Plate 69
13. Granjean, *Coupe de l'Élysée ou Cimetière public* illustrated in *Grands Prix d'architecture: Projets couronnés par l'Académie d'architecture et par l'Institut de France*, Allais, Détournelle et Vaudoyer engravers and eds., Paris, 1806, Plate 67
14. Détournelle, illustrated in *Des funérailles, Mémoire qui a concouru pour le prix de l'Institut an IX*, Paris, year IX, Plate 2
15. Granjean, *Elysée, Plan Général*, illustrated in *Grands Prix d'architecture: Projets couronnés par l'Académie d'architecture et par*

l'Institut de France, Allais, Détournelle et Vaudoyer engravers and eds., Paris, 1806, Plate 64

16. Guignet, *Elysée ou Cimetière public*, illustrated in *Grands Prix d'architecture: Projets couronnés par l'Académie d'architecture et par l'Institut de France*, Allais, Détournelle et Vaudoyer engravers and eds., Paris, 1806, Plate 68

17. Arnaud, *Tomb of Marie Pierre Joseph Thian*, Montmartre cemetery, c. 1805, in *Receuil des tombeaux*, vols. 2, 1825, Plate 49

18. *Tomb of Jean André Larmoyer*, Montmartre cemetery, c. 1801

19. A. T. Brongniart, *Père Lachaise cemetery, General Plan and View of the Entrance*, watercolour and ink, c. 1810, Musée Carnavalet

20. A. T. Brongniart, *Père Lachaise cemetery, General Plan and Eight Views*, watercolour and ink, c. 1810, Musée Carnavalet

21. A. T. Brongniart, *View of the Projected Peristyle, Père Lachaise cemetery*, detail from illustration 20

22. A. T. Brongniart, *View of a Projected 'Monument de marque', Père Lachaise cemetery*, detail from illustration 20

23. A. T. Brongniart, *View of a Projected 'Monument de marque', Père Lachaise cemetery*, detail from illustration 20

24. A. T. Brongniart, *View of the Greffuhle Chapel, Père Lachaise cemetery*, detail from illustration 20

25. Normand, *3e vue du cimetière de l'Est, les tombes de Brongniart et Delille*, engraving, *Monuments funéraires*, Paris, 1832, Plate 61
26. View of the Bosquet Delille today, Père Lachaise
27. *Tomb of Maximilien Joseph Hurtault*, c. 1824, Père Lachaise
28. *Tomb of François-André Vincent*, c. 1816, Père Lachaise
29. *Tomb of Pierre-Louis Ginguéné*, c. 1816, Père Lachaise
30. *Sixième Vue, Monumens de Jacques Delille et du Chevalier de Boufflers*, illustrated in Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques, historiques et morales du Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1822
31. *Tomb of A. T. Brongniart*, c. 1813, Père Lachaise
- 32a. *Tomb of André Ernest Modeste Grétry*, c. 1813, Père Lachaise
- 32b. Courvoisier, *1ère vue du cimetière du Père Lachaise près du tombeau de l'Abbé Delille*, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
33. *Tomb of Talma*, c. 1826, Père Lachaise
34. David d'Angers, *Talma*, Plaster model, 1827, Musée David D'Angers
35. *Tomb of Mlle. Raucourt*, c. 1815, Père Lachaise
36. *Tomb of Marie Hélène Bourgoïn*, c. 1833, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes

- 37a. *Tomb of Guillaume Lagrange*, c. 1807, Père Lachaise
- 37b. *Tomb of Guillaume Lagrange*, detail, c. 1807, Père Lachaise
38. *Tomb of Marie-Joseph Chénier and family*, Père Lachaise
39. *Tomb of Antoine François de Fourcroy*, c. 1809, Père Lachaise
- 40, 41. *Tomb of Antoine Augustin Parmentier*, c. 1813, Père Lachaise
42. Roger, *Tomb of Mme. Barilli*, in *Receuil de tombeaux*, 1817, plate 27, No. 1313
43. V. J. Vicole, *Vue du Monument élevé à la mémoire du général Desaix*, (Place Dauphine), watercolour, Château de Malmaison
44. *Monument érigé sur la Place Victoire en l'honneur du général Desaix*, engraving, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris
45. J.-D. Dugourc, *Translation des restes de Louis XVI et de Marie-Antoinette, à Saint-Denis, le 21 janvier 1815*, ink wash and watercolour, Musée Carnavalet, Paris
46. Edme Gaulle, *Louis XVI and Pierre Petitot, Marie-Antoinette*, marble, Saint Denis, Paris
47. Antoine-François Gérard, *Translation of the Remains of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette to Saint-Denis*, c. 1825, marble bas-relief, Chapelle Expiatoire, Paris

48. Bosio, *Louis XVI*, 1816-1835, Marble, Chapelle Expiatoire, Paris
49. Cortot, *Marie-Antoinette supported by Religion*, marble, Chapelle Expiatoire, Paris
50. Bosio, *Louis XVIII*, c. 1826, plaster, Musée de Versailles
51. Joseph Beaume, *Pose de la première pierre du monument à la mémoire de Louis XVI, le 3 mai, 1826*, 1827, oil on canvas, Musée de Versailles
52. Cortot, *Louis XVI*, Plaster model of the monument for the Place de la Concorde, 1826-1830, Musée de Versailles
53. Fontaine, arch., *Chapelle Expiatoire*, entrance or vestibule
54. Fontaine, arch., *Chapelle Expiatoire*, main chapel
55. Fontaine, *Chapelle Expiatoire, Floorplan, Cross-section and Elevation*, 12 December, 1815, ink and wash, Caisse nationale des monuments historiques et des sites
56. Giovanni Pisano, Cloister of the *Campo Santo*, 1270-1278 (Gothic tracery added 15th century), Pisa
57. Lower galleries, *Chapelle Expiatoire*, Paris
58. *Tomb of the Ghirlande*, Via dei Seplocri, Pompeii

59. Gérard, *Two Angels Kneeling Before the Tablets of the Ten Commandments*, pendentive, Chapelle Expiatoire, Paris
60. Godde, Entrance, Père Lachaise, c. 1825
61. Brongniart, *Project for Père Lachaise Entrance*, c. 1810, detail of ill. 20
62. Brongniart, *Project for Père Lachaise Entrance*, c. 1810, detail of ill. 20
63. Godde, *Central Chapel, Père Lachaise*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
64. François-Frédérique Lemot, *Henri IV*, 1817, bronze, Pont Neuf, Paris
65. Charles Dupaty and Cortot, *Louis XIII*, 1829, marble, Place des Vosges, Paris
66. Duvivier, *La Statue de Louis XVI par Cortot*, sepia wash, Musée Carnavalet, Paris
67. Anon., *Projet de monument à Louis XVI*, graphite and watercolour, Musée Carnavalet, Paris
68. Girodet-Trioson, *Ossian Receiving Napoleonic Officers*, 1802, oil on canvas, Château de Malmaison
69. *Apotheosis of Louis XVI*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
70. *Apotheosis of Louis XVI*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes

71. Cortot, *Justice*, detail *Louis XVI Monument*, Plaster model of the monument for the Place de la Concorde, 1826-1830, Musée de Versailles

72. Cortot, *Piety*, detail *Louis XVI Monument*

73. Cortot, *Benevolence*, detail *Louis XVI Monument*

74. Cortot, *Tolerance*, detail *Louis XVI Monument*

75. Lemot, *Henri IV distribuant du pain aux parisiens*, 1817, bronze bas-relief, *Henri IV Monument*, Pont Neuf, Paris

76. Engraving after Leon Vaudoyer, *Monument élevé en l'honneur du général Foy, député du département de L'aine, dédié à MM. les souscripteurs*, March, 1828, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes

77. David d'Angers and Léon Vaudoyer, *Foy Monument*, 1826-1831, Père Lachaise

78. *Esprit du Général Foy, Parfum Législatif*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes

79. David d'Angers, *Condé*, Plaster model, 1817, Musée David d'Angers

80. David d'Angers, *Bonchamps*, Plaster model, 1825, Musée David d'Angers

81. David d'Angers, *Fénélon*, Plaster model, 1828, Musée David d'Angers
82. David d'Angers, *Young Greek Girl at the Tomb of Marco Botzaris*, Plaster model, 1823-1827, Musée David d'Angers
83. David d'Angers, *Monument to General Gobert*, 1833-1847, Père Lachaise
84. David d'Angers, *Foy in Spain*, Plaster model, Musée David d'Angers
85. *Trait de bravoure du général Foy*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
86. *Tombe provisoire du général Foy*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
87. David d'Angers, *Return of the Duc d'Angoulême*, plaster model for the Carroussel bas-relief, Private Collection
88. David d'Angers, *Foy in the Chamber of Deputies*, Plaster model, Musée David d'Angers
89. César Daly, *Tomb of Garnier-Pagès*, engraving, *Architecture funéraire contemporaine, Spécimens de tombeaux, chapelles funéraires, mausolées, sarcophages, stèles....choisis principalement dans les cimetières de Paris*, Paris, 1871, 'Mort et Glorification', Plate 7
90. *Convoi du général Foy*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes

91. David d'Angers, *Foy's Funeral Procession*, Plaster model, Musée David d'Angers
92. David d'Angers, *Foy*, Plaster model, Musée David d'Angers
93. Vaudoyer, *Foy Monument*, 1, November, 1826, graphite and wash, Musée Carnavalet, Paris
94. Vaudoyer, *Foy Monument*, drawing, Musée Carnavalet, Paris
95. David d'Angers, *Foy in Modern Dress*, drawing, Musée David d'Angers
96. David d'Angers, *Gouvion Saint-Cyr*, c. 1833, Plaster model, Musée David d'Angers
97. Horace Vernet, *Napoleon's Tomb*, c. 1821, oil on canvas, Wallace Collection
- 98, 99. *Apothéose du général Foy*, engravings, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
100. Tomb of Nicolas Lallemand, c. 1820, Père Lachaise
101. Tomb of Manuel and Béranger, Père Lachaise
102. David d'Angers, *Plaster model for the tomb of Armand Carrel*, 1839, Musée David d'Angers

103. François Rude, Tomb of Godefroy Cavaignac, 1856, Montmartre Cemetery
104. Jules Dalou, *Tomb of Victor Noir*, 1891, bronze, Père Lachaise
105. Jules Dalou, *Tomb of Auguste Blanqui*, 1885, Père Lachaise
106. Cortot and Leclère, *Tomb of Casimir Périer*, 1832-1837, bronze and stone, Père Lachaise
107. *Salle des Séances*, engraving, Jules de Joly, *Plans, coupes, élévations et détails de la restauration de la Chambre des Députés, de sa nouvelle salle des séances, de sa bibliothèque, suivis de la salle provisoire*, Paris, 1840
108. Achille Leclère, *Cortot Monument*, watercolour, Musée Carnavalet, Paris
109. Francisque Duret, *Casimir Périer*, marble, Palais Bourbon
110. Cortot, *Eloquence*, bas-relief on Périer tomb, Père Lachaise
111. Cortot, *Fortitude*, bas-relief on Périer tomb, Père Lachaise
112. Cortot, *Justice*, bas-relief on Périer tomb, Père Lachaise
113. Augustin Pajou, *Justice and Strength*, Palais Royal, Paris
114. Pajou, *Prudence and Liberality*, Palais Royal, Paris
115. Augustin Dumont, *Justice*, marble, Palais Bourbon

116. Louis Desprez, *Strength*, marble, Palais Bourbon
117. Denis Foyatier, *Prudence*, marble, Palais Bourbon
118. A. Allier, *Eloquence*, marble, Palais Bourbon
119. Sir Francis Chantrey, *William Pitt*, c. 1831, bronze, Hanover Square, London
120. Visconti and Bernard-Gabriel Seurre, *Molière fountain*, c. 1844, Paris
121. Visconti, *St Sulpice Fountain*, c. 1848, Paris
122. David d'Angers, *Aux grands hommes la Patrie reconnaissante*, 1830-1837, Pediment of the Pantheon
123. David d'Angers, *Cuvier*, 1838, plaster model, Musée David d'Angers
124. Jean Jacques Feuchère, René-Jules Puteau and Vigoureux, *Cuvier Fountain*, 1840-1846, Paris
125. Alfred Philibert, *Mausoleum of Adolphe Thiers*, 1886, Père Lachaise
126. Henri Chapu, *Patriotism defending the flag held by the figure of France*, bas-relief, Thiers mausoleum

127. Jean-Camille Formigé and Denys-Pierre Puech, *Monument to the Municipal Workers of the City of Paris*, c. 1906, Père Lachaise
128. *Tomb of La Bédoyère*, c. 1815, Père Lachaise
129. *Tomb of La Bédoyère*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
130. Arnaud, *First Tomb of Marshal Ney*, c. 1815, in *Receuil des tombeaux*, vol. 2, 1825, plate 45
131. *Ils pleurent un compagnon d'armes*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
132. Jolimont, *Tomb of Marshal Ney*, illustrated in Jolimont, *Les Mausolées*, Paris, 1821
133. Horace Vernet, *Peace and War (Le Soldat laboureur)*, Wallace Collection
134. *Sépulture du Maréchal Ney*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
135. Bosio, Théodore-Napoléon Jacques and Vincent, *Tomb of Masséna*, Père Lachaise
136. Germain and Jacot, *Tomb of Sérurier*, Père Lachaise
137. *Troisième vue, Le Maréchal Lefèbvre choisissant sa place dernière auprès du Maréchal Masséna*, illustrated in Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques, historiques et morales du Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1822

138. David d'Angers, *Tomb of Marshal Lefèbvre*, Père Lachaise .

139. Jean-Baptiste-Louis Plantar, *Tomb of Marshal Perignon*, Père Lachaise

140. Louis-Parfait Merlieux, *Towing of the Glorieux, Battle of 12 April, 1782*, Tomb of Admiral Decrès, Père Lachaise

141. Louis-Parfait Merlieux, *The Combat of the Guillaume Tell, Malta, 30 March, 1800*, Tomb of Admiral Decrès, Père Lachaise

142. David d'Angers, *Monument to General Gobert, 1833-1847*, Père Lachaise

143. David d'Angers, *At the battle of Vicoigne, the dying General Dampierre entrusts Gobert with the remains of the army and his battle sabre. 'I hope that I will do it justice' replies Gobert*, bas-relief, Tomb of General Gobert Père Lachaise

144. David d'Angers, *At the battle of Vicoigne*, detail

145. David d'Angers, *General Gobert in Santo Domingo, Freeing French Prisoners from a House Set to Explode*, bas-relief, Tomb of General Gobert Père Lachaise

146. David d'Angers, *General Gobert Putting Down an Uprising in Bologna*, bas-relief, Tomb of General Gobert Père Lachaise

147. David d'Angers, *The Death of Napoleon Gobert*, bas-relief, Tomb of General Gobert Père Lachaise
148. David d'Angers, *General Gobert in Santo Domingo*, detail
149. David d'Angers, *General Gobert*, plaster model, Musée David d'Angers
- 150a. Guillard, *Tomb of General Ruty*, c. 1828, Père Lachaise
- 150b. Théophile Bra, *Bust of General Ballesteros*, c. 1833, bronze, Père Lachaise
151. David d'Angers, *Albani Stele*, drawing, Musée des Beaux Arts, Angers
152. J. Chinard, *La Mort de Desaix*, sketch for a monument commissioned in 1801 for Clermont-Ferrand, clay, Louvre, Paris
153. Westmacott, *Monument to General Abercromby*, 1802-1805, marble, Saint Paul's Cathedral, London
154. August Kiss, *Mounted Amazon Attacked by a Panther*, illustrated in *The Art-Journal Illustrated Catalogue, The Industry of All Nations, 1851*, London, 1852, p. 37
155. David d'Angers, *Sketch for Gobert Monument*, Musée David d'Angers
156. David d'Angers, *Larrey Monument*, 1846, bronze, Paris

157. David d'Angers, *Larrey Monument*, detail
158. David d'Angers, detail, *Battle of Somo Sierra*, Larrey Monument, plaster model, Musée David d'Angers
159. *Tomb of Larrey*, Père Lachaise
160. François Rude, *Sketch for Ney Monument*, Terracotta, Musée des Beaux Arts de Dijon
161. *Execution du Maréchal Ney*, engraving, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
162. *Exécution de Labédoyère*, engraving, Musée Carnavalet
163. Rude, *Monument to Marshal Ney*, (c. 1850-1853), bronze, Paris
164. Rude, *Monument to Marshal Ney*, detail, Paris
165. *Tomb of Marshal Ney and Family*, c. 1903, Père Lachaise
166. Antoine Etex, *Tomb of Mme. Raspail*, Père Lachaise
167. Aimé Millet, *Tomb of Baudin*, Montmartre Cemetery
168. *Au meilleur des amis, des époux et des père*, lithograph, 1822, illustrated in Antoinette le Normand-Romain, *Mémoire de marbre*, Paris, 1995, p. 268

169. Arnaud, *Tomb of Antoinette Bobée*, in *Receuil des tombeaux*, vol. 2, 1825, Plate 69
170. Aimé Milhomme, *Tomb of Pierre Gareau*, c. 1815, Père Lachaise
171. *Jérôme family tombstones*, Père Lachaise
172. *Tomb of M. and Mme. Delabarre*, c.1830-1839, Père Lachaise
173. *Brongniart family tombs*, Père Lachaise
174. *Cartellier Family Tombs*, Père Lachaise
175. J.-B. Lesueur, arch., Petitot, *Amitié and Bust of Cartellier*, Dumont, Sagesse, Rude, *Bonté, Tomb of Pierre Cartellier*, 1838, marble, Père Lachaise
176. Petitot, *Tomb of Charlotte Cartellier Heim*, c. 1825, marble, Père Lachaise
177. E. Seurre, *Tomb of Geneviève Cartellier*, c. 1848, marble, Père Lachaise
178. Arnaud, *Lefèvre Family Tomb*, in *Receuil des tombeaux*, vol. 2, 1825, Plate 65
179. *Lefèvre Family Tomb*, Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes
180. Roger, *Briand Family Tomb*, in *Le Champs du Repos*, 1816, Plate XVI, No. 757

181. Arnaud, *Deladreue Family Tomb*, *Receuil des tombeaux*, vol. 2, 1825, Plate 57
182. Jolimont, *Kellerman*, in *Les Mausolées*, 1821
183. Arnaud, *Bonnomet Family Tomb*, in *Receuil des tombeaux*, vol. 2, Plate 53
184. Roger, *Clary Family Tomb*, *Le Champs du Repos*, 1816, Plate X, no. 577
185. *Gémond Family Tomb*, c. 1819, Père Lachaise
186. *Bouillat Family Tomb*, c. 1824, Père Lachaise
187. Roger, *Bosquillon Family Tomb*, in *Le Champs du Repos*, 1816, Plate XXII, No. 11086
188. *Brézin Family Tomb*, 1816, Père Lachaise
189. *Poreet Family Tomb*, c. 1814, Père Lachaise
190. Roger, *Gauthier Family Tomb*, in *Le Champs du Repos*, 1816, Plate 15, No. 735
191. Arnaud, *Kropper Family Tomb*, in *Receuil des tombeaux*, vol. 2, 1825, Plate 74
192. *Tardieu Family Tomb*, Père Lachaise
193. *Jacquemart Family Tomb*, c. 1804, Père Lachaise

194. Arnaud, *Fieffé Family Tomb*, in *Receuil des tombeaux*, vol. 1, 1817, Plate 21
195. Roger, *Soëhnée Family Tomb*, in *Le Champs du Repos*, 1816, Plate XI, No. 582
196. *Deuxième vue, Monument du General Berckheim et des familles Müller et Soëhnée*, in Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques*, 1822
197. *Quatrième Vue, Vue des tombeaux des familles Barry, Desfammes et Teysier*, in Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques*, 1822
198. *Barry Mauoleum*, Père Lachaise
199. *Houdaille Mausoleum*, Père Lachaise
200. Roger, *Délépine Family Tomb*, in *Le Champs du Repos*, 1816, Plate 14, No. 715
201. *Macdonald Mausoleum*, Père Lachaise
202. *Frochot Mausoleum*, Père Lachaise
203. *Otto and Pelet Mausoleum*, Père Lachaise
204. *Perregaux Mausoleum*, Père Lachaise
205. *Lafitte Mausoleum*, Père Lachaise
206. View of Père Lachaise

207. *Thirion and Maillard Family Mausoleums, Père Lachaise*

MAP 1: *Plan du Cimetière*, in Vincent de Langlade and Renaud Marchand, *Une Heure au Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1983

MAP 2: Detail, depicting the *camp des braves* and *bosquet du Dragon*, from Map, Marchant de Beaumont, *L'Observateur au Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1824

Introduction

In 1820, when Emily Henderson visited Paris, no visit was complete without an excursion to the cemetery of Père Lachaise. 'We all went this morning to the Cimetière of Père la Chaise', wrote Emily in her diary, 'the celebrated burial ground, where everything ancient and modern ~~that can be~~ laid hands on is brought together for show. The ground is said to contain 80 acres, and is on the ascent of a hill, so that tombs rise in ranks, and as they are mostly planted with firs, shrubs and flowers, the effect of these mixed with mausoleums, columns, and other memorials of death, is exceedingly pretty...the tomb of Abelard greets you here, those of Boileau, Moliere, and Racine there. Here a warrior who fought at Fontenoy, and continued fighting till 1793; there an insignificant tomb, guarded with heavy chains, denotes the resting place of a shopkeeper who died worth a great deal of money...Paris is seen to great advantage from Père Lachaise...'¹ Emily disapproved of Père Lachaise for its lack of religious character, but nonetheless her description of the site is a useful one. The cemetery had opened in 1804, on a former Jesuit Estate, regularly frequented by the confessor to Louis XIV, a Père Lachaise, from whom it had taken its name. Since then, it had become famous for the combination of picturesque greenery, and monumental tombs described by Emily. Scattered throughout the landscape were tombs of many of the nation's most famous figures, works by the nation's most prominent architects and sculptors, as well as the tombs of the most ordinary of individuals. Its

¹Emily Henderson, *Recollections of the Public Career and Private Life of the Late John Adolphus*, London, 1871, pp. 118-119

function as a burial place for a large portion of the Parisian population instilled a certain private character, but its popularity and fame as a kind of national outdoor museum or pantheon appended a very public quality to the cemetery. In 1820 it was unique in its genre and to a certain extent is still unequaled today.

Situated on the outskirts of Paris, the cemetery fulfilled plans for removing burial from the inner-city and creating suburban hygienic burial spaces that dated back to the mid-Eighteenth Century. At various stages, four of these cemeteries had been planned to the east, west, north and south of Paris. It was not until 1824 that another was opened to the north at Montmartre, which had already been previously used as a cemetery for a few years, approximately from 1798 to 1808. In 1825, the cemetery at Montparnasse was opened to the south. Even after the opening of Montmartre and Montparnasse, for a number of years, perpetual concessions were available only ^{at} Père Lachaise.² As a result, for the first half of the century Père Lachaise remained unique in the sheer number of illustrious figures commemorated, in the magnificence of its monuments and also in its green and picturesque landscape. None of the other cemeteries had the advantage of the natural qualities of the former Jesuit estate, the same abundance of greenery, or the winding roads at Père Lachaise, tending instead more towards rigid, grid patterns.

For art historians the monuments of Père Lachaise have produced a wealth of material for study. Many studies have focused almost exclusively on aesthetic issues, along much the same lines as for any

²See Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire du curieux dans le cimetière du Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1828, pp. 31 and 46

other work of sculpture or architecture. For some this has meant superimposing existing aesthetic categories or terms such as Neoclassical, Romantic etc. on to funerary monuments.³ All too often the analysis has also been limited to the work of well-known artists, and the meaning of funerary works within the context a particular artist's oeuvre. However, nineteenth-century audiences were as, if not more, concerned with the actual individual commemorated as with the aesthetic value of the monument or sculpture itself. For example, in the preface to his *Receuil des tombeaux* (1817), Arnaud claimed that his selection was guided by choosing tombs that were most remarkable by their execution as well as by the people they contained, or by the style of their epitaph, and, in fact, no artists are even mentioned in this anthology.⁴ Of the majority of the works executed at Père Lachaise only a small percentage can be traced back to specific artists and to ignore monuments because they lack interesting sculptural decor, or architectural interest, overlooks the meaning and import of the tomb in the Nineteenth Century. Thus relating funerary monuments exclusively to the general contemporary artistic production can fail to take into account the specific social and ideological context of their production.

According to Maurice Agulhon, cemetery monuments, such as those found in Père Lachaise are not only reflections of artistic production but also of the history of social mores, attitudes towards

³For example see Maurice Rheims, 'Funerary Art' whose analysis rests essentially on how funerary art expresses the existing stylistic categories such as Neoclassical, Romantic, Art Nouveau etc. *Nineteenth-Century Sculpture*, New York, 1977, pp. 329-335

⁴C. P. Arnaud, Preface, *Receuil de tombeaux des quatre cimetières de Paris avec leurs épitaphes et leurs inscriptions (Père Lachaise, Montmartre, Vaugirard, et Sainte Catherine dans le Faubourg Saint-Michel)*, 42 planches gravées, plan topographique du Père Lachaise, vols. 1 and 2, Paris, 1817 and 1825

death and religious beliefs.⁵ The cataloguers approach attempts to bring into play this wider context by itemizing the particularities of funerary art and establishing a classification of subjects, themes and motifs characteristic of the genre. For example Antoinette Le Normand-Romain's extensive writing on the subject has focused on themes such as separation, mourning figures, *gisants*, tragic death, portraiture, allegory and even bishops tombs, many of which offer insights into the particular and separate nature of funerary monuments in relation to the artistic production in general.⁶

Social historians have perhaps done the most to relate the production of funerary art with prevailing social mores, attitudes towards death and religious beliefs. Philippe Ariès' well known work on the perception of death through history links the iconography of death and the particular expansion of funerary monuments in the Nineteenth Century, to changing ideas about death and burial. He has described the establishment of a 'cult of death' during the Nineteenth Century - the result of a romanticized image of death inherited from the previous century - in which death was increasingly emphasized as a separation from loved ones, rather than a personal religious experience, consequently fostering a new interest in perpetuating their memory through the erection of tombs and frequent visits to the cemetery.⁷ In terms of iconography this trend yielded a tendency for depicting family

⁵Maurice Agulhon, 'La Statuomanie et l'histoire', p. 139 and 'Imagerie civique et décor urbain', pp. 105-106, *Histoire vagabonde, I, Ethnologie et politique dans la France contemporaine*, Paris, 1988

⁶See Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, 'De la mort paisible à la mort tragique', *La Sculpture française au XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1986 and *Mémoire de marbre: La Sculpture funéraire en France 1804-1914*, Paris, 1995

⁷See Philippe Ariès, *The Hour of our Death*, New York, 1980 and *Images of Man and Death*, Janet Lloyd, trans., Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1985

members mourning at the tomb, deathbed scenes, portraiture and clasped hands for example.⁸

Richard Etlin's work has linked the 'Père Lachaise phenomenon' to equally pervasive eighteenth-century debates such as those concerning urban hygiene and burial reform - which resulted in the eventual closure of insanitary and overflowing intramural cemeteries, such as that of the Cemetery of the Innocents in 1780 - and the desire for spacious, extra-mural replacements.⁹ Etlin also points to the role of humanist ideals about the celebration of the *grand homme* - an illustrious national figure, distinguished by great literary, scientific or military achievements for example - in the formulation of a new type of cemetery as a space for the commemoration of such individuals and a source of public emulation.¹⁰ Institutional practices such as the formulation of the program of the Academy's biennial *Prix d'Éloquence* from 1759 on as an *éloge académique*, an exercise consisting of the eulogy of a *grand homme* and in 1774, the publication by the newly appointed Director General of Royal Buildings, Comte d'Angeviller, of an ambitious program of paintings and sculpture commemorating French History and its illustrious figures, gave official status to these ideas.¹¹

The debate about the commemoration of the *grand homme* was even more specifically linked to the formulation of a new type of

⁸Philippe Ariès, *Images of Man and Death*, 1985, pp. 247-265

⁹Richard Etlin, *The Architecture of Death, The Transformation of the Cemetery in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1984, pp. 12-17 and 22-39

¹⁰Etlin, *The Architecture of Death*, 1984, pp. 42-63

¹¹For the academic elegy see Mona Ozouf, 'Le Panthéon, l'École normale des morts', *Les Lieux de mémoire, Vol. 1: La République*, Paris, P. Nora, ed., 1984, p. 148 and Andrew McClellan, 'D'Angeviller's 'Great Men' of France and the Politics of the Parlements', *Art History*, vol. 13, No. 2, June 1990, p. 178

cemetery in a series of contests at the Royal Academy of Architecture. In July 1765, August 1778 and in March 1787 the *Prix d'émulation* called for a cenotaph to Henri IV.¹² In each case the cenotaph of the monarch was to be surrounded by the statues and tombs of illustrious French figures, who had surpassed others in philosophy, letters, the arts, the military, the navy etc. In 1778, Turenne, Condé, De Saxe, Duguai-Trouin, Sully, Colbert, Descartes, Corneille, Racine, Perrault, Le Brun and Bouchardon were mentioned as possible candidates.¹³ In 1785, the *Grand Prix* re-iterated the same concerns, stipulating 'A sepulchral monument for the rulers of a great empire, located within an enclosure where the individual sepulchre of the great men of the nation will be placed.'¹⁴ The veneration of heroes such as Mirabeau, Marat, Lepelletier de Saint-Fargeau, Bara, Viala, Voltaire and Rousseau and the transformation of the Church of Sainte Geneviève in 1791 into a national Pantheon in honour of the great men of France can be seen as the continuation of these earlier developments, similarly adopting the figure of the *grand homme* for its social, didactic and political values.

Finally Etlin's work has also demonstrated that Père Lachaise reflected the Eighteenth-century predilection for the picturesque landscape as the ideal site for both cemetery and Elysium as proposed by Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's *Études de la Nature* in 1784¹⁵ and

¹²See J. M. Pérouse de Montclos, *Les Prix de Rome, Concours de L'Académie Royale d'architecture au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, 1984 and Etlin, *the Architecture of Death*, 1984, pp. 41 and 51

¹³ Pérouse de Montclos, *Les Prix de Rome*, 1984, p. 158

¹⁴'...Un monument sépulcral pour le souverains d'un grand empire, placé dans une enceinte dans laquelle on disposera des sépultures particulières pour les grands hommes de la nation.', in Pérouse de Montclos, *Les Prix de Rome*, 1984, p. 191

¹⁵Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, *Études de la nature*; vol. 3, 1784, pp. 364, 368-369, 372

realized to a certain degree in gardens such as Stowe, with its Elysian Fields, Ermenonville, with Rousseau's tomb and Monceau, in the *Bois des Tombeaux* designed by Carmontelle for the duc de Chartres, future Philippe Égalité.¹⁶ A cult of sentimental pilgrimages to the tomb, communing at once with nature, departed loved ones and experiencing a pleasurable *frisson* through sublime reflections on mortality and death, were linked to the idea of a picturesque pastoral setting.

While accepting the importance of these discourses in the genesis, evolution and function of Père Lachaise, there remain nonetheless important aspects of the space to be addressed. In his study of the phenomenon of the rise of the urban monument, 'La statuomanie et l'histoire', Aguhlon segregated the cemetery monument from urban monuments on the basis of fundamental differences of character, source and meaning. For Aguhlon, while the rise of the urban monument was a novel phenomenon, cemetery monuments belong to a so-called 'traditional' category.¹⁷ Aguhlon's argument fails to recognize that despite its basis in the eighteenth-century discourses outlined by Etlin, the nineteenth-century cemetery, and particularly Père Lachaise, was nonetheless a novel phenomenon. To begin with, the traditional private role of the cemetery was transformed during the first half of the Nineteenth Century into a very public one by a massive influx of guidebooks, visitors and tourists (such as Emily Henderson in 1820) to Père Lachaise. Furthermore, during this period Paris remained largely unavailable for the type of public urban monuments described by

¹⁶See Etlin, pp. 163-228; Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, *Études de la nature*; vol. 3, 1784, pp. 364, 368-369, 372; and *Jardins de France, 1760-1820*, Caisse nationale des monuments historiques, Paris, 1978.

¹⁷Maurice Aguhlon, 'La Statuomanie et l'histoire', pp. 139 and 149

Aguhlon. Historically the capital's public spaces had always been reserved for the glorification of the monarch and if the Consulate and Empire had initiated public commemoration in Paris with a fountain commemorating Louis Charles Desaix (who died at Marengo in 1800), in the former Place Dauphine in 1802 and an autonomous monument on the Place des Victoires in 1810, the monarch's privileged position was re-appropriated under the Restoration and not seriously challenged again until the erection of Rude's statue of Marshal Ney in 1853.

Furthermore, the very same principles of democratic commemoration which had resulted in monuments to non-royal individuals in the urban space and the ensuing 'statuemanía' of the second half of the century were inherent not only in the genesis of Père Lachaise, but even in its format by the incorporation of special sites reserved for the commemoration of illustrious figures.

In effect Père Lachaise prefigured urban 'statuemanía' in Paris during this period, by offering a highly visible space for official public commemoration, such as in the monument to Prime Minister Casimir Périer erected between 1832 and 1837. Moreover, at Père Lachaise the democratic nature of individual commemoration was in effect even greater than in the urban space, in that it allowed dissenting voices to express themselves as well, as in the enclave of Napoleonic military figures carved out during the Restoration and known as the 'General's Quarter', or in the monument erected by public subscription to General Foy, a liberal opposition leader until his death in 1825. In the face of this Fred Licht's assertion that 'the convulsive succession of political events, the constant changes of regime that led from the beginning of

the French Revolution to the explosion of 1848, are not reflected in the funerary sculpture of the time' seems implausible.¹⁸

The assemblage of monuments at Père Lachaise was actually perceived from very early on as a microcosm of all the vicissitudes of the city below. '... it is Paris all over again', claimed Balzac in 1833, 'with its streets, its signs, its trades, its mansions'.¹⁹ This comparison between Paris and Père Lachaise was a common and popular one, reiterated by writers and artists alike. Topographical views of the cemetery with the city visible in the distance emphasized the picturesque opposition between the space of the living and that of the dead, contrasting the urban city with the more verdant garden landscape of the cemetery, denoting both distance and proximity. (Illustrations 1 and 2) Yet Père Lachaise functioned as a mirror to the society in this city below, not only by recording its greatest individuals but by offering to all those who had the means the possibility of establishing their own monuments. Père Lachaise especially reflected the rise of the bourgeoisie during this period and their enhanced social and economic power, in the increasing number of impressive monuments and family mausoleums that vied with those of the great aristocratic families of the past. But the image of the cemetery as a mirror to society implies a passive, reflective role. In contrast, the urban monument is ascribed with an active, creative role, as the purveyor of official ideology, as the propagator of doctrines, as a tool in

¹⁸Fred Licht, 'Tomb Sculpture', *The Romantics to Rodin, French Nineteenth-Century Sculpture from North American Collections*, Los Angeles and New York, 1980, p. 96

¹⁹'...c'est encore tout Paris avec ses rues, ses enseignes, ses industries, ses hôtels...', Balzac, 'Ferragus, Scènes de la vie parisienne, Histoire des treize', *La Comédie Humaine*, vol. 9, Book 3, *Oeuvres Complètes*, Paris, 1966, p. 104

the formation of political ideology and identity. However, the equally active role of the cemetery monument is most obviously illustrated by examples such as the commemoration of former Prime Minister Casimir Périer, sponsored by his peers as a public subscription, but nonetheless identifiable as an attempt to construct a particular official political identity, within the public, well frequented context of Père Lachaise, where the monument could play as active a role as an urban one.

At Père Lachaise however, the erection of other monuments - dissentient, famous and obscure - can likewise be seen as actively participating in the formation of an even wider spectrum of political identities. Rather than simply recording the memory of Parisian society during this period, the complex mechanism of just who was commemorated, how and where, played a very important role in formulating that society's identity, or multiplicity of identities. As John R. Gillis writes "memories help us make sense of the world we live in; and 'memory work' is, like any other kind of physical or mental labour, embedded in complex class, gender and power relations that determine what is remembered (or forgotten), by whom, and for what end."²⁰

All the famous figures Père Lachaise did not necessarily have monuments erected by official channels, but by the consensus of family and friends. Nonetheless, their tangible, visible commemoration firmly embedded them in a collective memory, particularly if they were singled out in guidebooks, and the object of public interest and pilgrimage. The result was the formulation of a popular pantheon that included figures endeared to the collective memory but that did not

²⁰John R. Gillis, 'Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship', in J. R. Gillis (ed.), *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, Princeton, 1994, p. 3

always conform to the traditional criteria of the *grand homme*. For example, Parmentier a pharmacist and chemist, who died in 1813 was a necessary inclusion to any self-respecting guidebook of the period, but today he is a largely forgotten figure, unless one happens to pay close attention to the decor of the Parisian Metro station named after him. Parmentier's claim to fame was to have popularized the potato during the reign of Louis XVI, thus providing a means of alleviating famine when the wheat crop failed. For women, largely absent from public commemoration until this century, there was a unique possibility of expression and empowerment to be found. Famous actresses, an adventurer or two such as the balloonist Madame Blanchard and women writers, Madame Cottin, author of popular novels, who could never aspire to male dominated official homage such as Institut membership, all found a place in this collective, popular Pantheon. Particularly after the transfer of historical luminaries such as Molière, La Fontaine, Héloïse and Abélard in 1817, burial in Père Lachaise, in such illustrious company, might seem like a guarantee of entering into the annals of history, a chance to formulate an individual position vis-à-vis one's contemporaries.

'Our interest in *lieux de mémoire*, where memory crystallizes and secretes itself, has occurred at a particular historical moment, a turning point where consciousness of a break with the past is bound up with a sense that memory has been torn - but torn in such a way as to pose the problem of the embodiment of memory in certain sites where a sense of historical continuity exists'.²¹ Pierre Nora may have been

²¹Pierre Nora, 'Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*', Marc Roudebash, trans., *Representations*, No. 26, Spring 1989, p. 7

referring to late twentieth-century society in his study of memory and history, but the very same phenomenon can be discerned at Père Lachaise in the early Nineteenth Century. The erection of individual and family tombs represents the reification of memory in the hope of preserving or establishing a sense of historical continuity, either because the institutional framework for preserving those memories had been altered by political, social and economic factors, or because it had not previously existed. Just as Molière and La Fontaine were placed together, forming a historical unit, the existence of sympathetic congregational groupings of tombs of eighteenth-century thinkers, poets, artists and architects around the tomb of the poet Delille, composers and musicians grouped nearby, and ranks of united military figures in the so-called General's Quarter, and even bourgeois families in wooded groves and along main avenues, points to an attempt by the individuals involved to carve out historical identities and status through sites, proximity and association. During the Restoration, when the national Pantheon had been returned to the Church, and the capital's urban spaces to the monarch, Père Lachaise was in fact more or less the only venue for such formulations. The intensive activity dedicated to the commemoration of the monarch and particularly the 'cult of martyrs' of the Revolution centreing on Louis XVI, may actually be seen as part of the process of cementing the popularity of Père Lachaise as a forum of expression, a site for remembering popular, unofficial heroes.

Varied socio-economic groups, such as the Parisian bourgeoisie can be seen as participating in this race for historical status by the establishment of mausolea at Père Lachaise. These were more than simply a reflection of their social position and wealth, but an active part

of the process of establishing the validity of those claims. The family mausoleum acted as a foundation, a concrete appropriation of the aristocratic notion of dynasty and perpetuation over the generations. For provincials the establishment of a mausoleum firmly rooted them in Parisian society, in a public, visible manner that would be imprinted upon their peers on their own visits to the cemetery.

If there were those who did not qualify for a prominent position in the official histories and pantheons as a result of their gender or the level of their achievement, changes in government also dictated the terms of the definition of the officially recognized *grand homme*. Père Lachaise offered the possibility of forming alternative Pantheons, an alternative history, for the politically unacceptable. Dissenting groups found an almost unfettered freedom of expression, for with few exceptions, the space was largely uncensored. Opposition groups could rally, propagate ideas and establish their identities in relation to official urban monuments.

The search for governing themes and ideas, such as the garden landscape, the commemoration of the *grand homme*, attitudes towards death, the use of allegorical mourners or recumbent figures, is useful, but often assumes that the monuments at Père Lachaise can be easily organized under the rubric of a cohesive genre. This attempt to extract governing principles or themes has been one of the major stumbling blocks to understanding the function and meaning of these monuments. For Fred Licht, 'their freedom of conception, their total dedication to a specific life make it difficult to discern any kind of tradition here.'²²

What seems to Licht a lack is in fact a type of tradition based precisely on that freedom, that individuality. It is for this reason that while the

²² Fred Licht, 'Tomb Sculpture', p. 99

notion of underlying themes enhances to a certain degree our understanding of these monuments, they may also serve to mask the importance of the individual being commemorated and the particular circumstances of that act of commemoration. Likewise, even within the confines of Père Lachaise, one cannot assume uniformity of meaning as particular sites within the cemetery had different connotations. One would never dream of analyzing an urban monument without considering its individual characteristics such as political and historical circumstances and the significance of the site, and funerary monuments at Père Lachaise in particular need a similar approach. The relationship between the monument at Père Lachaise during the first half of the century and the Parisian 'statuemanía' have more in common than has been traditionally recognized. Both the urban monuments of Paris and the funerary monuments of Père Lachaise played a role in the formation of a variety of political identities, and this study will attempt to show that they in fact engaged in an active discourse with each other.

Chapter One

Defining the Nature of Commemoration in the Cemetery (1791-1804): Government Control vs. Individual Freedom

As a space where monuments to the illustrious were erected and viewed by the public, Père Lachaise was heir to eighteenth-century ideas and practices regarding the commemoration of the *grand homme* previously reified by the establishment of a national Pantheon at Sainte Geneviève in 1791. However, if Père Lachaise can be regarded as an embellishment or continuation of the Pantheon, it can equally be seen as the product of a reaction against the Pantheon. The establishment of the Pantheon in 1791 and the destruction of the tombs at Saint Denis in 1793 can be perceived as opposite sides of the same coin, the result of a single political ideology. Therefore, the impetus for expanding commemoration according to merit was actually related to its own opposite, the eradication of commemorative monuments, royal as well as others. The process of pantheonization reserved commemoration for official use, to the exclusion of other forms that were perceived as elitist signs of rank and birth and contrary to principles of democratic equality. Paradoxically, in establishing this democratic framework for equality and individual liberty, revolutionary politics had partially destroyed many aspects of individualism, emphasizing the equality of all citizens alike, a proposition, which taken to its radical extreme, militated against individual differences. As the French were channelled into the uniform category of citizens of the nation, their sense of differentiation as individuals was, to a certain degree subsumed. Even the distinctions awarded to an illustrious few levelled individual

differences, such as the contradictory natures of a Voltaire and a Rousseau, for example, in the service of the all-encompassing idea of the nation. Moreover, as a highly limited space of commemoration, the Pantheon also disregarded the ordinary individuals who constituted the great majority of the population. Père Lachaise, by allowing freedom of commemoration, albeit mostly for those with sufficient financial means, reinstated the position of the individual in relation to the *grand homme*, to the nation and to society at large. This conflict between the notion of the *grand homme*, the public, official monopoly on commemoration and the privileges of the private individual, was an essential aspect of the new cemetery and a key stumbling block of the debates leading to its formulation.

Both the establishment of the Pantheon in 1791 and of Père Lachaise in 1804, can in fact be seen as part of an ongoing discourse regarding the issue of commemoration, usually raised in the context of the debate on the problem of inhumation throughout the decade, and outlined in a series of official government reports, in the periodical press and in independent publications.¹ But if Père Lachaise shares it

¹Official reports included Chaumette, Procureur-syndic de la ville de Paris, *Rapport sur les cimetières, de l'Administration des Travaux publics*, Commune de Paris, 18, October, 1793

Jean-Baptiste Avril, *Rapport de l'Administration des Travaux Publics sur les cimetières, lu au Conseil-Général par le citoyen Avril, (21 Nivôse, year II)*, 10 January, 1794

Emmanuel Pastoret, *Rapport sur la violation des sépultures et des tombeaux, fait au nom de la commission de la classification et de la révision des lois*, Corps législatif, Conseil des Cinq-Cents, Séance du 26 Prairial, year IV (14 Juin, 1796), Paris, year IV;

Jacques Cambry, Administrateur du Département de la Seine, Administrateur du Prytanée français et de l'académie des antiquaires de Cortone, *Rapport sur les sépultures, présenté à l'Administration centrale du Département de la Seine*; Paris, year VII;

François-Antoine Daubermesnil, *Rapport fait au nom d'une Commission spéciale, sur les inhumations*, Corps législatif, Séance du 21 brumaire, an V, (11, November, 1796), Paris, year V.

sources with the Pantheon, it is equally the reification of what the critics felt the Pantheon was lacking. Criticism was, as Richard Etlin has pointed out, the result of 'conflicting beliefs about the proper setting for the dead'. For Etlin this disagreement centred on the idea that an architectural setting for the commemoration of the *grand homme* was at odds with the desire for a natural, outdoor setting, and certainly this view was well represented in the debates.² For example in 1793 the editor of the Jacobin *Journal de la Montagne*, J. Ch. Laveaux published his view on the subject: 'I would like the monuments destined to commemorate them [great men], to be visible to everyone; in the spaces consecrated to the entire nation...such as the Place de la Fédération [today's Champs de Mars] amidst the poplar trees, rather than the cold

Other publications included:

G.G. Delamalle, *Reflexions sur l'enterrement de ma mère, ou sur les cérémonies funéraires et de la moralité des institutions civiles en générale*, Paris, year 3, (1795);

Pierre-Louis Roederer, *Des Institutions funéraires convenables à une République qui permet tous les cultes et n'en adopte aucun*, read to the Institut national des Sciences et des Arts, 3 July, 1796 (15 messidor, year IV), Paris, year IV;

Jacques-Michel Coupé, (Membre du Conseil des Cinq-Cents), *Des Sépultures en politique et en morale*, Paris, Thermidor, an IV (1796)

François-Valentin Mulot, *Discours sur les funérailles et le respect du aux morts*, Lu le 15 Thermidor, an IV au Lycée des Arts, (August 2, 1796), Paris, year IV;

François-Valentin Mulot, *Vues d'un citoyen, ancien député à l'Assemblée législative, sur les sépultures*, year V;

Arsenne Thiébaut de Berneaud, *Réflexions sur les pompes funébres*, Paris, 1797, (Frimaire, an VI);

Pierre Giraud, architect, *Essai sur les sépultures*, with plans, sections and elevations of the projected monument, Paris, produced year IV, deposited at the Department of the Seine, 11 Décembre, 1798 (II Nivôse, year VII);

Jacques-Michel Coupé, *De la moralité des sépultures et de leur police*, Paris, year IX. These were often reviewed in the press, while other articles appearing in the periodical press included L., 'Sur les sépultures des grands hommes, et celles des autres citoyens', *Journal de la Montagne*, J. Ch. Laveaux, ed., N° 48, 19 Juillet 1793 (an II);

Charles Joseph Trouvé, 'Des honneurs qu'on doit rendre aux morts', *Moniteur Universel*, 26 germinal an III (15 April, 1795).

²Richard Etlin, *The Architecture of Death, The Transformation of the Cemetery in Eighteenth-century Paris*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1984, p. 230

sterile columns of the Pantheon.'³ In a speech delivered at the Institut in 1796, Pierre-Louis Roederer also proposed an outdoor equivalent: 'The abode of the dead is not on the *public thoroughfare*, as in antiquity, nor in *catacombs...*, nor in *vaults...*, nor in *cemeteries*, as in modern Europe, nor in *temples* erected especially for the dead, as in ancient Greece: the proper place for the dead is in a sacred wood...'.⁴ The establishment of Père Lachaise in a natural, picturesque setting can be seen as a result of these perceived shortcomings of the Pantheon, however, the question of nature versus architecture was not the only way in which Père Lachaise was symbolically an anti-Pantheon.

The debate between the proponents of an architectural or a natural Elysium had been addressed and resolved to a great extent by Alexandre Lenoir at the Museum of French Monuments, which opened

³Il seroit bien temps de ne plus renfermer dans des caveaux, et entre des masses de pierres, les cendres de grands hommes qui ont bien mérité de la patrie. Je voudrois que les monuments destinés à leur mémoire, fussent exposés à tous les yeux, dans les endroits consacrés à la nation entière, parcequ'ils appartiennent à la nation entière, et que la vue de ces monuments, nous rappelleront plus souvent et les grands services qu'ils auroient rendus à la république, et les exemples qu'ils nous auroient laissés à imiter...Quels sentiments élevés, quel respect solennel n'inspireroit pas, par exemple, la place de la fédération, si entre les peupliers qui la décorent, s'élevoient des monuments simples, des pierres carrées ou pyramidales qui indiqueroient la sépulture des grands hommes, et ne porteroient pour toute inscription que le nom de chacun d'eux. Qu'on se figure toute la France rassemblée par ses représentans au milieu de cette place, autour de l'autel, l'amour et l'exécution des lois, ne leur sembleroient-ils pas que les mânes des hommes qui ont fondé la république, qui l'ont cimenté de leur sang, recevraient eux-mêmes ces sermons, et les rendroient par leur présence plus inviolables et plus sacrés?', L., 'Sur les sépultures des grands hommes, et celles des autres citoyens', *Journal de la Montagne*, J. Ch. Laveaux, ed., No. 48, 19 July, 1793 (year II)

⁴'La place des morts n'est ni sur les *chemins publics*, comme chez les grecs et les romains, ni dans les *catacombes...*, ni dans les *caveaux...*, ni dans les *cimetières*, comme chez les Peuples de l'Europe moderne, ni dans des *temples* élevés aux morts eux-mêmes, comme chez les grecs des temps historiques: la place des morts est dans un bois sacré...', Pierre-Louis Roederer, 'Politique-Institut National: Des Institutions funéraires convenables à une République qui permet tous les cultes et n'en adopte aucun, [une partie du mémoire lu à l'Institut National le 3 Juillet 1796 (15 Messidor year IV)]', *Moniteur universel*, No. 294, 12 July, 1796 (24 Messidor year IV)

to the public 12 October, 1794.⁵ Concerned by the destruction of the nation's artistic heritage, the National Assembly had passed legislation safeguarding works of art and the municipality of Paris had nominated a Museum Commission to seek out locations for storing the sculptures taken from Saint-Denis, mausoleums and tombs left homeless by the expropriation of church land and property, as well as manuscripts, paintings etc. that had been expropriated from the monarchy, aristocracy and church. In 1791 Alexandre Lenoir was put in charge of the task and proposed that a special museum be designated for these rescued French monuments and as a result, the former convent of the Petits Augustins, which had been used as a depository, was handed over to Lenoir's direction as the newly created *Musée des Monuments Français*.⁶

Many of the sculptures received by the museum were funerary monuments, not only of the French monarchy, but of illustrious historical figures as well. Picking up on Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's ideas in *Études de la Nature*, and those voiced by others like Laveaux and Roederer, Lenoir dreamed of creating a space filled with the tombs and statues of renowned Frenchmen in what he called the Elysium Garden of the museum, which eventually included some of the most illustrious and memorable figures of French history. (Illustration 3) Descartes had originally been buried in a vault at Sainte Geneviève but in 1793 his remains were removed from the church and entrusted to

⁵The museum opened 12 vendémiaire, year III. *La Grande encyclopédie, Inventaire raisonné des sciences, des lettres et des arts*, Berthelot, et. al., eds., 31 vols., Paris, n.d., vol. 22, p. 10

⁶ Alexandre Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français, ou Description historique et chronologique des statues en marbre et en bronze, bas-reliefs et tombeaux des hommes et des femmes célèbres, pour servir à l'histoire de France et celle de l'Art*, 8 vols., Paris, 1800-1821, vol. 1, 1800, p. 1

the Museum of French Monuments, pending a decision to pantheonize him. The philosopher was of particular national and historical importance, his remains having been the focus of national pride since the days of Louis XIV, when some 15 years after Descartes' death in Sweden in 1650, the French king demanded the return of his ashes to France.⁷ Pantheonization would have in effect returned him to his original resting place, but with a completely different connotation, by which his memory was now appropriated by the Republic.

In 1799 Lenoir sought to have transferred to his new museum the remains of Molière, France's most famous comic playwright and actor, and La Fontaine, chronicler of fables, which had been exhumed in 1792 due to the destruction of the church and cemetery of Saint Joseph, and had since remained homeless.⁸ The transfer coincided with that of Turenne, Louis XIV's greatest general, who had originally been buried at Saint Denis, and that of Jean Mabillon (1632-1707) and Bernard de Montfaucon (1655-1741), two renowned Benedictin scholars, formerly buried at Saint Germain-des-Près.⁹ Other monuments commemorated the poet Boileau, and the famous lovers, Héloïse and Abélard. Not only did the new picturesque Elysium garden provide a contrast to the architectonic Pantheon, but it also challenged the official definition of the *grand homme* embodied by the pantheonization process.

⁷ Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, pp. 74-6

⁸ Lenoir petitioned the Minister of the Interior, 2 Germinal, year 7 (22 March, 1799). Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments français*, vol. 8, Paris, 1821, pp. 161-2 and 165

⁹ 2 Prairial year 7 (May 21, 1799), Permission sought from the members of the Directoire executif to obtain an order for the translation of the remains of Mabillon and Montfaucon from the chapel of the Holy Virgin, of the refectory of the abbey of Saint Germain-des-Près, where they are buried, to the Museum of French Monuments. Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 8, Paris, 1821, p. 169

The controversy over the pantheonization of Descartes illustrates this fundamental difference. In 1796, the *Conseil des 500* awarded the honours of the Pantheon to Descartes, but the transfer never took place.¹⁰ Opposition to the transfer was based on a variety of factors, and especially on the issue of what useful political role the figure of Descartes could possibly play. At a session of the *Conseil des 500*, Louis-Sébastien Mercier remarked that 'the French Pantheon is the temple of the Republicans: reserve it for the heroes and martyrs of the revolution. Let us leave behind the books, their authors...What would be the purpose of such an apotheosis? Will the people find instruction in it? Have the people often heard the name of Descartes pronounced?'¹¹ Yet while Descartes' pantheonization was halted because of its lack of political importance, in 1800, Napoleon Bonaparte had the remains of Turenne transferred to the Invalides, transforming the church into a military Pantheon as part of an ongoing program for the glorification of militarism. These two cases demonstrate that in spaces like the Pantheon and the Invalides commemorative practices were firmly based on immediate political needs, whereas commemoration in the Elysium garden was open to individuals who did not necessarily fulfill an immediate official role. Descartes failure to depart and Turenne's success, point to the Elysium garden, as a space less governed by specific political agendas and more inclined to commemorate, on the basis of fame and popular appeal, individuals

¹⁰*Moniteur Universel*, No. 235, 14 May, 1796

¹¹'Le Pantheon français est le temple des Républicains: réservez-le pour les héros et les martyrs de la révolution. Laissons-là les livres et leurs auteurs...Quel serait le but d'une telle apothéose? Le Peuple y trouverait-il de l'instruction? Le peuple a-t-il entendu prononcer souvent le nom de Descartes? *Moniteur Universel*, No. 235, 14 May, 1796

who, like Descartes, did not necessarily live up to the official definition of the *grand homme*.

The Minister of the Interior, Neufchâteau, advised Lenoir 'to characterize each tomb', in the new garden, 'with the symbolic attributes of the virtues and of the genius of the *grand homme* to which it will be consecrated, and to imprint upon these monuments the character that they should represent.'¹² Lenoir followed the advice creating monuments that reflected the individual characteristics, achievements and the history of the figures represented in the Elysium garden and also embodied an architectural style that was highly characteristic of the serious funerary nature of the monuments.

For Molière, Lenoir designed a sarcophagus, borne on four pillars, ornamented with the particular attributes of the playwright's achievements in the comic genre. (ill. 4) While masks representing comedy and tragedy were common features in the commemoration of playwrights, Lenoir used only the comic mask for Molière combined with attributes of the Thalia, the muse of comedy.¹³ At the base of La Fontaine's sarcophagus two bas-reliefs depicted some of his famous fables, the Wolf and the Lamb on one side, and the Wolf and the Stork, on the other. (ill. 5) A black marble fox placed directly on top of the sarcophagus represented La Fontaine's most famous fable of the Fox and the Crow, with the fox apparently waiting for the piece of cheese he tricked the crow into dropping.¹⁴ Other tombs followed along the same

¹²'Je vous invite à caractériser chaque tombeau par des attributs symboliques des vertus et du génie du grand homme auquel il sera consacré, et d'imprimer à ces monuments le caractère qu'il doivent présenter.' Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 8, Paris, 1821, p. 166

¹³Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, p. 197

¹⁴Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, p. 199

lines, such as that of Descartes, consisting of a sarcophagus supported by griffins, animals composed of both the lion and the eagle, symbols of Jupiter, and therefore of the sun. (ill. 6) According to Lenoir, these 'astronomical' animals were representative of Descartes' work in the sciences.¹⁵

Economy sometimes required that Lenoir re-use salvaged elements as in Turenne's case, where Lenoir would have liked to create a new tomb, but the original had been transferred from Saint-Denis and Neufchâteau saw no reason to spend unnecessary funds.¹⁶ For other monuments, Lenoir resorted to using fragments from other monuments, as in the tomb of Montfaucon, created from an amalgamation of remnants of Egyptian figures and hieroglyphs, Greek reliefs, and debris from monuments dating from the early days of the French monarchy incorporated into an antique *stele* form.¹⁷ (ill. 7) As such, it may not seem like much of an original creation, yet its design suited its function as an homage to a great antiquarian who had produced a ten volume series entitled *Antiquité expliquée* and whose most important work consisted of five volumes of *Monuments de la monarchie française*.¹⁸ Therefore, Montfaucon's monument, with its combination of original remnants from antiquity and various royal monuments reflected the content of his greatest achievements. Likewise, the monument to

¹⁵Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, p. 195

¹⁶'Il me paraît inutile de construire un nouveau tombeau pour recevoir les restes de Turenne: vous le déposerez dans le superbe monument destiné à cet usage, qui embellit dans votre Musée la galerie du Dix-septième siècle.', F. de Neufchâteau, 15 floréal, year 7 to Lenoir in Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 8, Paris, 1821, p. 166

¹⁷Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 5, Paris, 1806, p. 202

¹⁸Bernard de Montfaucon, *Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures, en latin et en français*, 10 vols., Paris, 1719-1724 and *Monuments de la monarchie française*, 5 vols., Paris, 1729-1733

Héloïse and Abélard was an amalgamation of salvaged parts. (ill. 8) The tomb of Abélard had been originally placed, thanks to his friend Peter the Venerable, in the chapel of the infirmary at Saint Marcel-les Châlons. The remains of the tomb made its way to the Museum and Lenoir created a structure out of bits of debris from that tomb and other monuments. Inside he placed the figure of Abélard in the medieval prone position, taken from the original tomb. Next he took a sculpture of a woman from Héloïse's own time and superimposed her mask onto it, and placed it lying down next to Abélard.¹⁹ The surrounding chapel was produced in a gothicizing style, with ogival vaults from bits and pieces of a chapel from the abbey of Saint Denis.²⁰

In relation to the figures chosen for official commemoration, Lenoir's little band was in many cases more memorable for sentimental or popular reasons than for any outstanding contributions to society. If the name of Descartes was not often heard, as Mercier had claimed, La Fontaine's fables and Molière's comedies had a massive appeal for the public. Despite Abélard's considerable scholarly achievements, as one of the founders of scholasticism, his important role in establishing the reputation of the school of Paris for logical and philosophical studies and his body of religious writings, he was nonetheless best remembered for his tragic love-affair with Héloïse.²¹ There were few salutary effects of emulation and veneration to be found in this particular monument. Instead what emerges from the garden Elysium is a concept of an alternative, popular museum of historical figures, a different history

¹⁹Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 1, Paris, 1806, p. 218

²⁰Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, vol. 1, Paris, 1800, p. 222

²¹*Medieval Culture and Society*, David Herlihy, ed., New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco and London, 1968, p. 190

from that officially established at the Pantheon. Moreover, as a result of its emphasis on monuments for commemoration and recollection of individual characteristics and achievements, Lenoir's Elysium opposed the emphasis on festival, ceremony and the ephemeral nature of the funeral festivals of the 1790's.

Lenoir was in effect reformulating a tradition that had fallen by the wayside during those years, retrieving and reinventing to a certain degree the form and appearance of the funerary monument. His monuments relied heavily on architectural forms and styles themselves, rather than sculpture to emphasize individual achievements and history. Equally, as Neufchâteau had advised, the forms of sarcophagi, urns on pillars (Boileau and Rehault), and stele were correlated to their funereal function. (ill. 9) If major funerary monuments of the past had often relied on the depiction of the human figure, Lenoir banished the figure and opted for almost pure architectonic forms that were in themselves funereal in character. Except in the case of Abélard and Héloïse, where the use of the *gisant* figure served to emphasize the historicism of the piece, the human figure had been eliminated from death imagery. With its natural setting, its alternative historical focus and its emphasis on the actual physical presence and appearance of the tomb, Lenoir's Elysium was probably much more important than the Pantheon, in paving the way for the new cemetery and its formulation at Père Lachaise.

However, Lenoir's museum, still failed to resolve the crucial issue of the position of the 'ordinary individual'. In regards to criticism of the Pantheon, Etlin has pointed out that 'while the debate centred on the honours due to the great men of France, the arguments adduced applied

to ordinary citizens as well. Often critics would couple their suggestion for both categories of citizens in the same letter or essay.²² While Etlin's intention is to point out the desire for ordinary citizens also to be buried in a natural setting, this observation brings forth another equally important aspect of the debate which had fundamental repercussions for the appearance and function of the proposed cemeteries. Location was certainly an issue, but the very ideological and institutional framework of commemoration established by the Pantheon was equally in question, and in particular in regards to the ordinary individual. The political ideology of the revolution had set in motion the appropriation of many aspects of private life, education, religion and even the family, for example, and handed them over to state control.²³ The question of commemoration can be seen in a similar manner, as the conflict between an absolute centralized control and individual freedom, and opinions were divided as to which approach to adopt.

There those who felt that the commemorative practices and funereal institutions spearheaded by the Pantheon needed to be enlarged upon, to encompass a wider section of the population, by the establishment of new cemeteries, which would be, as discussed above, located in natural settings outside the city. In the new cemeteries, almost everyone involved agreed that the mass grave, which allowed for no individual differentiation, should be abolished, but just how much freedom, if any, should be given over to individual

²²Richard Etlin, *The Architecture of Death*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1984, p. 230

²³See Lynn Hunt, 'Public Institutions and Private Beliefs' in 'The Unstable Boundaries of the French Revolution', *A History of Private Life, IV, From the Fires of the Revolution to the Great War*, Michelle Perrot, ed., Arthur Goldhammer, trans., Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1990, pp. 25-38

commemoration had yet to be resolved.²⁴ Opinions were graduated between those who opposed any kind of individual commemoration as elitist and undemocratic, and those who believed in a *laissez-faire* attitude, allowing individuals complete freedom to erect monuments.

Many of the proposed ideas for the new cemeteries largely reiterated the idea of the Pantheon and the commemoration of the nation's meritorious, but on a larger scale, to include a greater spectrum of figures. For example, the Administration of Public Works' second report on cemeteries by Jean-Baptiste Avril in 1794 proposed a central monument inscribed with the names of the meritorious, but the essence of commemoration still greatly resembled that of the funeral festivals, relying heavily on ephemeral ceremony rather than on permanent individualized monuments: on a given day, public officers, members of government and the general public would congregate at the cemetery to honour the nation's heroes in eulogy as well as inscription.²⁵ Deputy Paul-Benois-François Bontoux' report on inhumations to the *Conseil des 500*, July 12, 1796 proposed the creation of proper cemeteries in each municipality which also focused on the meritorious, with each municipality responsible for honouring citizens who had distinguished themselves through military, administrative, artistic or virtuous achievements.²⁶ While extending the right of commemoration

²⁴For example, Jean-Baptiste Avril's report to the Commune, 10 January 1794, proposed the creation of four cemeteries on the outskirts of the city of Paris which would receive the populace at large in a dignified manner. There were to be no mass graves in these cemeteries, assuring each individual the right to a private grave. Individual, however, does not necessarily mean personalized. Avril, *Rapport*, 10 January, 1794, (21 Nivôse, year II)

²⁵Avril, *Rapport*, 10 January, 1794, (21 Nivôse, year II), pp. 17-19

²⁶Bontoux, 'Corps Législatif-Conseil des 500-Séance du 24 Messidor, year IV (12 July, 1796), Au nom d'une Commission: Rapport sur les inhumations, et un projet de résolution à cet égard', *Moniteur Universel*, No. 298, 16 July, 1796

to a larger pool of illustrious figures than at the Pantheon, outside of officially promoted and sanctioned tributes, the right of other individuals to commemoration was still strongly denied. Pierre Gaspard Chaumette's report to the Commune of Paris in 1793 illustrated this opinion, approving commissioner Fouché's measures in the Department of Nièvre, which abolished all individuals signs in the cemetery.²⁷ In 1794 and 1796, Avril and Bontoux, still represented the wide-spread objection to individual monuments which they saw as a return of the old inequalities between rich and poor.²⁸

A number of unofficial publications concurred with the government reports, such as that of the celebrated lawyer, G. G. Delamalle, who published his views in 1795 after witnessing the horrific spectacle of his mother's own burial in an anonymous mass grave. While calling for clearly demarcated individual tombs, Delamalle nonetheless still felt that signs, symbols and markers should be eschewed in favour of a solitary tree.²⁹ Since 1789, the tree had already replaced the monument in many aspects of ceremony and commemoration and was typically associated with revolutionary ideals

²⁷Fouché, *Arrêté*, 'Article 5. Le lieu commun où les cendres reposeront sera isolé de toute habitation, planté d'arbres sous l'ombre desquels s'élèvera une statue représentant le Sommeil. Tous les autres signes seront détruits.', Nevers, 19 September, 1796, reprinted in Michel Ragon, *L'espace de la mort, Essai sur l'architecture, le décoration et l'urbanisme funéraires*, Paris, 1981, p.234. For Chaumette's report see, *Moniteur Universel*, No. 30, 21 October, 1793

²⁸'Nous ne proposerons pas de renouveler les mausolées superbes, qui semblaient jadis, vouloir faire revivre, après la mort, tout le faste et l'orgueil de ceux qui avaient insulté, pendant leur vie, à la misère du peuple.' Avril, *Rapport*, 10 January, 1794, (21 Nivôse, year II), p.4. Bontoux claimed that 'toute pompe, tout appareil funèbre qui n'est pas déterminé par la présente, demeure interdite et défendue comme contraire à l'égalité.' Bontoux, 'Rapport sur les inhumations...', *Moniteur Universel*, No. 298, 16 July, 1796

²⁹G.G. Delamalle, *Refléxions sur l'enterrement de ma mère*, Paris, year 3, (1795)

such as liberty and regeneration.³⁰ Still, the following year, Jacques-Michel Coupé, a member of the *Conseil des 500*, published his more severe views, claiming that 'no tomb must have any other distinction than the name of the person'.³¹

Taken to the extreme, this kind of attitude mitigated against all monuments, even the distinctions awarded to the meritorious. Following an earlier report on tombs by deputy Emmanuel Pastoret to the *Conseil des 500* in June 1796, deputy Perrières had actually denounced the system of laying so-called heroes to rest in great pomp while the common man went to his grave in ignominious circumstances:

'We erect pantheons to men who have often been awarded honours simply because chance had put them in the limelight, and the individual, obscure perhaps, but useful, virtuous, like some domestic animal, whose remains are thrown onto the thoroughfare, goes to his final resting place alone, and without pomp.'³²

In response to Bontoux' suggestions for the meritorious, deputy Vousseu likewise objected to any inequalities whatsoever on the question of

³⁰Mona Ozouf, *Festivals and the French Revolution*, Alan Sheridan, trans., Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, 1988, pp. 243-256

³¹'Aucune tombe ne doit avoir d'autre distinction que le nom de la personne...', Coupé, *Des Sépultures en politique et en morale*, Paris, Thermidor, an IV (1796), p. 15

³²'Nous élevons des panthéons pour des hommes qui souvent n'ont mérité les honneurs que parce que le hasard les avait placés sur de grands théâtres, et l'homme obscur il est vrai, mais utile, mais vertueux, semblable à un l'animal domestique dont les restes sont jetés à la voirie, se rend seul et sans honneurs au lieu de sa sépulture.' Pastoret, 'Corps Législatif-Conseil des 500: Rapport sur la violation des sépultures et des tombeaux, fait au nom de la commission de la classification et de la révision des lois, Séance du 26 Prairial, year IV (14 Juin, 1796)', *Moniteur Universel*, No. 271, 19 June, 1796

tombs: citizens should be equal in death as in life.³³ And Baraillon cried out: 'Funeral ceremonies in a democratic society!'³⁴ In this manner, the debates over the question of inhumation outlined in the official reports during this period, 1793 to 1796, seriously threatened the annihilation of unofficial private monuments, and to some extent even individual funerary monuments dedicated to the meritorious.

While there were those who remained to the very end staunchly opposed to the concept of individual monuments, by 1796, both official reports and private publications seemed to veer increasingly away from such radical egalitarian principles, advocating greater concessions to individual private commemoration. Bontoux' report of November 1796 had concentrated on the commemoration of the illustrious to the detriment of other individuals but later that year François-Antoine Daubermesnil delivered another report on the subject to the *Conseil des 500*, which proposed allowing tombs to be marked by a tree, as Delamalle had proposed in 1795, and also a stone bearing only the name of the deceased.³⁵ For François-Valentin Mulot, writer and former member of the Legislative Assembly, this was still too limited, and he published a response to Daubermesnil, asking 'why force someone to plant only a tree, if they have the means to place some other monument' and claimed that this was in fact 'contrary to individual freedom, a disadvantage to the arts and to the propagation of social and domestic virtues' and advocated the right to erect individual

³³Bontoux, 'Rapport sur les inhumations...', *Moniteur Universel*, No. 298, 16 July, 1796

³⁴'Des pompes funèbres dans un état démocratique!', Baraillon in Bontoux, 'Rapport sur les inhumations...', *Moniteur Universel*, No. 298, 16 July, 1796

³⁵Daubermesnil, *Sur les Inhumations*, Paris, Brumaire, year V, (11, November, 1796), p. 10

monuments with more freedom.³⁶ This was an opinion Mulot had already voiced publicly at a reading of his *Discours sur les funérailles et le respect du aux morts*, at the Lycée des Arts 2 August, 1796. The poet Gabriel-Marie Legouvé expressed the same view in his poem, *La Sépulture*, read to the Institut National on 6 October, 1796, demanding that there at least 'be a monument erected in the woods that says to the son: It is here that your father is placed.'³⁷ Legouvé's verses were so popular that two years later a second edition was published.³⁸

This transformation of opinion in regards to erecting markers and monuments can be linked to the general attempt to fill the void left by the abandonment of traditional religious ceremony and ritual. As Mona Ozouf has pointed out, 'the whole thinking of the Directoire...agreed on the *horror vacui* left by the persecution of Catholicism and on the imperious need to replace it.'³⁹ This coincided with the religious theophilanthropic society's first meetings, dated from 1795, at the beginning of the Directory government, a society deeply imbued with the philosophic ideals of the Eighteenth Century, and especially the ideas of Voltaire and Rousseau, stressing the importance of the belief in

³⁶'...pourquoi forcer à ne placer qu'un arbre, celui qui peut y placer un autre monument?'...'contraire à la liberté individuelle, à l'avantage des arts, à la propagation des vertus domestiques et sociales'. F. V. Mulot, *Vues d'un citoyen, ancien député de Paris à l'Assemblée législative, sur les sépultures*, year V, p. 11 and 18

³⁷G. Legouvé, *Les Souvenirs, la sépulture et la mélancolie*, Paris, year VI (1798), p. 31

³⁸ Because Legouvé's verses linked the ransacking of the tombs of Saint-Denis with the abolition of all individual tombs, Michel Ragon has seen in them a seditious quality that he claims was censored and not published until 1801 when these views were more in line with official policy. But as noted above, a second edition of the poem was already in circulation in 1798. Michel Ragon, *L'espace de la mort, Essai sur l'architecture, la décoration et l'urbanisme funéraires*, Paris, 1981 p.252

³⁹ Ozouf, *Festivals and the French Revolution*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, 1988, pp. 267-8

God and the immortality of the soul, as had the cult of the Supreme Being, but also put great emphasis on the family. In particular its credo called for children to honour their parents, for parents to instruct their children properly and for women to honour their husbands as the head of the household, consequentially, it was believed, ensuring domestic happiness. These doctrines were also perceived as instrumental to the re-establishment and preservation of morality, public order and property.⁴⁰ Important members included Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Louis-Sébastien Mercier, Daubermesnil, one of the founders of theophilanthropy, and Mulot.⁴¹

This attempt to re-establish customs, rituals, etc. as a fundamental part of preserving social order was closely tied to the re-establishment of individual markers and tombs. The progress of theophilanthropy was halted by the establishment of the *cultes décadaires* - which replaced Sundays with another day of rest, the *decadi* - in October 1798 and by the Concordat in 1801 but these new religious developments were equally concerned with the maintenance of the social order and therefore inclined to continue the move towards the eventual sanctioning of individual monuments. The Concordat consummated this by renouncing the most extreme state controls on worship and belief.⁴² This eventual re-establishment of religious tolerance, and individual

⁴⁰Pierre Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire universel du dix-neuvième siècle*, vols. 1-17, Paris, 1864-1886, vol. 15, 1876, p. 87; *La Grande encyclopédie*, 31 vols., Paris, n.d., vol. 30, p.1192; Décembre-Alonnier, *Dictionnaire de la Révolution française*, Paris, vols. 1-2, 1975, vol. 2, pp. 692-3

⁴¹See Pierre Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire*, Paris, vol. 6, 1870, p. 141 and vol. 11, 1874, p.681

⁴²Lynn Hunt, 'Public Institutions and Private Beliefs' in 'The Unstable Boundaries of the French Revolution', *A History of Private Life, IV, From the Fires of the Revolution to the Great War*, Michelle Perrot, ed., Arthur Goldhammer, trans., Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1990, pp. 25-26

choice, with the State's continued right to interfere if it deemed necessary, mirrored precisely the transformations in regards to the debate between state control of commemoration and individual freedom. The emergence of individual freedom in religious belief paralleled the move towards freedom of commemoration and the erection of individual monuments, being equally safeguarded by clauses which permitted state control if necessary.

This process of transformation was brought to the fore in 1798, as official opinion pronounced itself decidedly in favour of individual monuments. Cambry, administrator at the Department of the Seine, was asked to visit the existing cemeteries of Paris and to make a report on the state they were in for the Department, a report which eventually shifted the balance of the debate clearly towards individual freedom and the right to erect monuments. The political issue of radical equality that had dominated the arguments against individual monuments in the past was a redundant one under the Directoire as fortunes were being made and a new elite was establishing itself and the question of eradicating social differences fell by the wayside. For Cambry, individual monuments were no longer a threat to political integrity but rather a tool for establishing political stability and confidence. Cambry claimed that after the despair of the Terror, the French people needed 'gentle and sentimental ideas, signs, ingenious relationships, bonds of all kinds...'⁴³ After the disquieting notion of abolishing social inequality

⁴³'Le peuple français doit sentir à présent combien il a besoin d'idées douces et sentimentales, de signes, de rapport ingénieux, de liens de toute espèce, pour ne pas retomber dans le dénuement absolu qui l'a presque conduit à la barbarie.' Cambry, *Rapport sur les sépultures, présenté à l'Administration centrale du Département de la Seine, par le citoyen Cambry, administrateur du Département de la Seine*, Paris, year VII, p. 12

and differences, the comforting signs of social hierarchy, such as the possibility of erecting imposing tombs, were being reestablished and Cambry advised:

'Let then each individual act according to their own taste and desires. Wise men, content yourselves with a simple urn; rich men, erect tombs that will employ the architect, the painter and the thousands and thousands of labourers you will employ.'⁴⁴

He concluded that '...equality is no more compromised by a tomb in a cemetery than by a palace in our cities.'⁴⁵

Cambry's report in essence paved the way for the re-emergence of the individual funerary monument and was reflected in the *Arrêté* of 18 December, 1798 (28 Frimaire year VII), which lifted the ban on funerary monuments.⁴⁶ Cambry submitted a proposal, which was illustrated with drawings by Molinos, for a *Champs de Repos* in the form of a circular garden, presented as a natural setting, with trees, greenery and winding paths. (ill. 10) Monuments were dispersed throughout in a seemingly random manner as well as displayed strategically in *rond-points* along the paths, or at intersections. Several paths connect the peripheral road to the centre, where space for a large pyramidal monument had been allocated. The plan still privileged the *grand homme* with a central monument, an enormous pyramid, with a base of twenty-eight meters, crowned by a tripod, but managed to

⁴⁴'Laissons donc à chacun la liberté d'agir conformément à ses goûts, à sa volonté. Sages, contentez-vous d'une urne simple, riches, élevez des tombeaux qui nourriront l'architecte, le peintre et les mille et mille manoeuvres que vous employez.' Cambry, *Rapport sur les sépultures*, Paris, year VII, p. 13

⁴⁵'...l'égalité n'est pas plus compromise par un tombeau dans un cimetière que par un palais dans nos villes.' Cambry, *Rapport sur les sépultures*, Paris, year VII, p. 22

⁴⁶See Etlin, *The Architecture of Death*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1984, p. 259

combine this type of commemoration with that of the less illustrious and the ordinary, perhaps wealthy, individual.⁴⁷ The abandoned quarries of Montmartre were destined for transformation into Cambry and Molinos' ideal cemetery and a cemetery, or *Champ de Repos* as it was called, did open there in 1798, but the projected designs were never implemented. To begin with it was probably too small and by 1808 the mass graves were actually full and the cemetery had to be closed down.⁴⁸ In essence, the cemetery at Montmartre only served as a stop-gap as the issues continued to be thrashed out and the debates about inhumation and commemoration continued.

The government's continuing concerns over the inability to resolve this problem were reflected in two important contests sponsored by the Institut in the search for a solution. On the heels of Cambry's report, in 1799 the programme of the Grand Prix for Architecture called for an 'Elysium or public cemetery', stipulating a simple monument at the centre surrounded by porticos to house monuments to illustrious figures.⁴⁹ Shortly thereafter, Lucien Bonaparte, Minister of the Interior, addressed a letter to the Institut,

⁴⁷Cambry, *Rapport sur les sépultures*, Paris, year VII, pp. 65-66 (See Plate III for interior of monument and position of *grand hommes*)

⁴⁸Antoine Caillot, *Voyage pittoresque et sentimental au Champ de Repos sous Montmartre et à la maison de campagne du Père Lachaise à Mont Louis*, Paris, 1808, p. 17.. According to Hillairet, the cemetery closed sometime between 1806 and 1808. Jacques Hillairet, *Les 200 cimetières du vieux Paris*, Paris, 1958, 1958, p. 316

⁴⁹See Plate 62, *Élisée ou cimetière public*, Prix accordé à Gasse, 1799, (year 7): 'Programme: Cet Elisée sera environné de terrasses ou de plantations propres à la promenade et au recueillement. Il sera d'un accès facile et qui n'ait rien de repoussant. Au centre sera un monument ou cénotaphe commun, ouvert de toutes parts et environné de portiques pour recevoir les tombeaux des hommes illustres. Les souterrains serviront de dépôt pour les corps. Le terrain sur lequel l'Élisée avec ses accessoires sera . projeté n'excédera pas 500mètres dans sa plus grande dimension.' in *Grands Prix d'architecture: Projets couronnés par l'Académie d'architecture et par l'Institut de France*, Allais, Détournelle et Vaudoyer, engravers and ed., Paris, 1806

dated the 22 February 1800 (5 Ventôse, year VIII), pointing to the importance of funerary ceremonies and urging the proposal of the following question for a forthcoming contest: 'What are the necessary ceremonies for a funeral, and what regulations should be adopted for the site of burial?'. The programme also stipulated that participants were to indicate the disposition and decoration of the cemetery.⁵⁰ Both these contests reflected many of the issues debated in reports to the government over the last decade, namely the commemoration of illustrious individuals, the rivalry between architectural and picturesque natural settings and the right of ordinary individuals to choose and erect monuments.

In 1799, Gasse and Grandjean were awarded first prizes; Guignet won the second prize and their projects understandably gave priority to architectonic visions rather than pastoral ones, although trees and greenery were an important aspect of some of the plans. The programme for this contest resembled earlier ones that had called for cenotaphs to Henri IV in 1765, 1778 and 1787 and a 'Funerary Temple' for kings and great men in 1766 and 1785. These antecedents had also stipulated a central monument, dedicated to the monarch, with a peripheral gallery dedicated to great men. The image of the monarch may have been deleted from the contest of 1799, but in other respects, hardly anything had changed.

In 1799, both Gasse and Guignet chose entrances in the form of pyramids with porticoed temple doorways. (ills. 11 and 12) Although

⁵⁰Quelles sont les cérémonies à faire pour les funérailles, et le règlement à adopter pour le lieu de la sépulture? The program was put together by March 12, 1800. Camus et al., *Institut National, Rapport contenant le programme d'un Prix*, Paris, n.d.

the pyramid had long been adopted as a commonly recognized funerary form, the two projects bear a great resemblance to previous prize-winning entries such as Desprez' 1766 central royal monument, Dufourny's 1778 cenotaph to Henri IV, and Fontaine's 1785 sepulchral monument for the rulers of a great empire. Grandjean opted for another favourite funerary form, a porticoed dome, previously seen in Moreau's 1785 prize-winning entry, which echoed Boullée's cenotaph to Newton of 1784. (ill. 13) Gasse too may have been influenced by Moreau, as the floor-plan of his central monument looks remarkably like his predecessor's. Whether offered under the Ancien Regime or the Directoire, programme and results were uncannily alike, pointing to the durability and continuity of an architectural institution despite changing titles and great political upheaval, for it was clear that not only had the stipulations of architectural contests survived almost intact through the changes of the last decade, but so had much of the architectural theories.

It is perhaps because of its basis in tradition that ultimately the 1799 contest was not able to respond to current needs and demands. The contest had looked at the endeavor almost purely as an artistic aesthetic enterprise, ignoring the utilitarian aspect. Criticism of the results, such as those voiced by F.-S.-J.-S. Andrieux, President of the *Conseil des 500*, pointed to their unrealistic scale and expense: 'There are columns, pyramids, vaults and ornaments which would cost a fortune to execute', predicting that 'this competition will not give us any cemeteries.'⁵¹ By this time the Institut had already sponsored the

⁵¹Quoted in Etlin, *The Architecture of Death*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1984, p. 291

second contest proposed by Lucien Bonaparte. This elicited more realistic and up-to-date proposals, less hampered by convoluted architectural structures or the Grand Prix tradition and more attuned to the business at hand. One of the reasons for this was that the 1800 contest was specifically launched in the government's name and was less of an educational exercise within the art world than part of an attempt to find a definitive solution to the long-standing problem of inhumation.

In general in 1800, the architectural detail proposed was of a very limited and straightforward nature. Amaury Duval and François-Valentin Mulot were awarded joint first prizes, and interestingly enough their respective opinions represented opposite sides of the debate over individual commemorative monuments. However they agreed on specifically avoiding the lavish architectural fantasies engendered by the Grand Prix of Architecture.

'I will erect no pyramids and no porticos; I do not want funeral pyres or funerary urns, etc. I have glossed over all those handsome projects for Elysiums that were being published not so long ago, and I felt that their authors had no other desire but to interest their readers for a few moments with fantastic scenes, with the spectacle of a succession of theatrical decors', wrote Duval.⁵² Other contestants concurred, such as Pommereuil, who demanded that the architecture be kept to a strict simplicity, with no

⁵²'Je n'élève point de pyramides, de portiques, je ne veux point de bûchers, point d'urnes funéraires, etc. J'ai parcouru tous ces beaux projets d'Elysées que naguères on a publiés, et j'ai cru que leurs auteurs n'avaient eu d'autre but que d'intéresser quelques instans leurs lecteurs par de fantastiques tableaux, par le spectacle d'une suite de décorations théâtrales.' Amaury Duval, *Des Sépultures, Ouvrage couronné par l'Institut National*, Paris, year IX (1800-1801), p. 43

more than one storey.⁵³ The difference is well illustrated by the stark contrast between the complex entrances and other structures, housing guardians, administration etc., proposed by the architects Gasse, Grandjean and Guignet in 1799, and those included by Détournelle in 1800 with his essay, where the entrance and central monument are of the simplest nature.⁵⁴ (ill. 14)

Particularly noticeable was the difference in attitude towards the position of the illustrious between the 1799 and 1800 prize-winners. The architectural entries were particularly lavish in their honours, exemplified by Grandjean's proposal to allocate space for the remains of the illustrious, not only in the central monument with galleries stipulated by the program, but also for more such monuments within the rest of the cemetery. (ill. 15) Monuments consecrated to the virtues and a Temple of Virtue for more meritorious individuals were complemented by the insertion of a tribune and large amphitheatre for the reading of eulogies of the meritorious. This 'Amphitheatre for the people who will judge if the deceased has merited being enrolled and laid to rest in the Temple of Virtues'⁵⁵ thus incorporated the elegy, a literary academic exercise, which had become a standard Academy contest form during the Eighteenth Century, into the very format of the cemetery. In Guignet's proposal the mandatory central monument was accompanied by a strip of tombs destined for those who distinguished

⁵³F.-R.-J. Pommereuil, *Mémoire sur les funérailles et les sépultures. Question proposée par le Ministère, et jugée par l'Institut, le 15 vendémiaire an IX*, Paris and Tours, year IX, p. 29

⁵⁴C. Détournelle, *Des funérailles, Mémoire qui a concouru pour le prix de l'Institut, an IX*, Paris, year IX, Plate 2.

⁵⁵Plate 64 in *Grands Prix d'Architecture*, Paris, 1806

themselves by their civic virtues, surrounding practically the entire cemetery. (ill. 16)

In 1800 however, Duval and Mulot, while recognizing that the nation must reward its illustrious citizens, gave little or no precedence to the meritorious in their cemeteries. Mulot simply suggested that the government reserve for itself the right to inscribe epitaphs proclaiming public honours, for public service or military valour. All others should confine themselves to recalling private virtues in the epitaphs of their loved ones. Duval's cemetery made no room whatsoever for the illustrious. More than simply avoiding the pitfalls of grandiose architecture, Duval went to the other extreme of utilitarianism and his *Champs de morts*, as he called it, was completely stripped bare of all decoration: there would be no monuments at all, whether individual or communal.⁵⁶ Above all, this cemetery was a public space, dedicated in its entirety to all men equally.⁵⁷ Given the government's assertion of the right of individuals to bury their loved ones on private land, Duval felt that if a family desired individual monuments they should do so on their own land and not in the municipal cemeteries. The illustrious on the other hand could be commemorated within the city centre, such as at the Pantheon, where they could truly be appreciated by the public.⁵⁸

While the debate had generally veered in the last three years towards the acceptance of individual commemorative monuments, Duval had seemingly remained faithful to the radical egalitarian concept

⁵⁶Duval wrote: 'Il n'y a de terrain inutilement employé que celui couvert par des monuments d'orgueil, par des monuments qui ne sont habités que par des morts. Ce sont ces monuments que je proscrirais dans le lieu des sépultures publiques.' Duval, *Des Sépultures*, Paris, year IX, p. 43 and note p. 41 respectively.

⁵⁷Duval, *Des Sépultures*, Paris, year IX, pp. 44-45

⁵⁸Duval, *Des Sépultures*, Paris, year IX, p. 39

of all individuals being buried in like manner, with no distinctions. There were others who agreed with Duval, like J. M. Coupé - who had already published his views on the subject in 1796 and reiterated them again in the context of the recent contest - still refusing to allow for any other monuments other than those designated to the illustrious by the nation.⁵⁹ The political arguments of the 1790's for a radically egalitarian society, where all citizens would be buried in like manner, without pomp, circumstance or memorial monument, however, were outdated and outnumbered by this time. In Duval's case this vision of a cemetery with no distinctions probably stems more from his view of death and the function of the cemetery than from his political beliefs, as in his essay he stated emphatically that 'the sight of tombs is an object of fear and disgust!'⁶⁰

Had the Institut chosen to award the prize solely to Duval and taken on board only his suggestions as the blue-print for the cemeteries in planning, the future might indeed have lost the wealth of statuary and architecture found in Père Lachaise today. By 1800 however, Duval was in the minority: both the 1799 and 1800 contests had yielded results largely in favor of allowing individuals the freedom to erect private monuments. In general tradition and practical considerations of space and expense had dictated the maintenance of the mass grave for the general population, but limited areas had also been given over to individual tombs such as on Grandjean's plan, where the *fosses communes* or mass graves were situated in an arc embracing the back of the amphitheatre (the virtuous would literally step over the common

⁵⁹Coupé, *De la moralité des sépultures et de leur police*, Paris, year IX, p. 27

⁶⁰'...la vue des tombeaux est pour nous un objet de dégoût et d'effroi!' Duval, *Des Sépultures*, Paris, year IX, p. 41

on their way to the Temple of Virtues on the other side) and private burial plots were allocated to a small surrounding strip of land shaded with trees. (ill. 15) Guignet offered 400 mass tombs, perhaps one for each day of the year and then some, and private plots were confined to a small area of the cemetery, less than one eighth of the entire area. (ill. 16)

For a more widely accepted vision of what the cemetery should be, and its desired position within society, one must look to Mulot and his use of the term *Champs de Repos*. This peaceful, restful image of the cemetery and death as sleep was a more widely accepted view by 1800, as opposed to Duval's outdated image of horror.⁶¹ The word *cimetière* used in the past, for example as in the *Cimetière des Innocents*, with all its negative connotation had been practically abandoned for the use of the term Mulot adopted and when a new burial ground was opened at the old quarries of Montmartre in 1798, it was dubbed the *Champs de Repos*.⁶² Rather than feeling fright and disgust at the encounter with the tomb, as Duval had, one could be relieved by the peaceful vision of eternal rest. The cemetery was the space where family and friends could come to console themselves for the loss of their loved ones. Feelings of love and attachment, tenderness and regret were depicted as positive sentiments to be encouraged. These ideas had their source in eighteenth-century sentimentalism, which glorified the tomb, particularly in nature, as a place to meditate and experience the

⁶¹Mulot, *Discours qui a partagé le prix proposé par l'Institut National de France, au nom du Gouvernement, et décerné le 15 vendémiaire an IX...sur cette question: Quelles sont les cérémonies à faire pour les funérailles, et le règlement à adopter pour le lieu de la sépulture?*, Paris, year IX, p. 56

⁶²For a list and history of the evolution of alternative terms, see Elin, *The Architecture of Death*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1984, p. 229

sublime. Poems such as Young's *Night Thoughts* (1742-5), Robert Blair's *The Grave* (1743) and Gray's *Elegy in a Country Churchyard*, which had over thirty English editions between 1751 and 1880, appeared in French in 1769 and in 12 more French editions by 1824, had fostered these kinds of ideas.⁶³ The individual tomb was a necessary part of playing out these sentiments, as was the notion that the cemetery was more than just fulfilling a necessary function but also a place to visit for its own sake.⁶⁴ This concept of the visit, of public access and visibility, was an essential aspect of the formulation of the new cemetery and again one which opposed to a certain degree the existing spaces of commemoration. The architect Vaudoyer for example had criticized the establishment of the Pantheon for this very reason, as he felt that such an enclosed space, like the military tombs at the Invalides and Richelieu's tomb at the Church of the Sorbonne would rarely be visited. The outdoor alternative he suggested-the transformation of the Champs-Élysées into a modern-day Via Appia- was not simply a resolution of the architecture versus nature debate based on reasons of sentimentality, but also a means of ensuring a great degree of publicness, which he saw as an essential aspect of any national Elysium.⁶⁵

Mulot's ideas about the function of the cemetery as a space to visit therefore meant that the individual tomb must be given an important position within the cemetery, and he allocated the area along the enclosing walls of the cemetery for individual tombs, monuments and

⁶³Dora Wiebenson, *The Picturesque Garden in France*, Princeton, 1978, p. 328

⁶⁴Mulot referring to the Cambry/Molinos project 'un des plus beaux monuments de Paris'. Mulot, *Discours qui a partagé le prix*, Paris, an IX, note 1, p. 76

⁶⁵See Etlin, *The Architecture of Death*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1984, p. 230

epitaphs.⁶⁶ The concept of an enclosing wall or gallery of monuments had a famous precedent at the Campo Santo in Pisa and had already been suggested as a suitable format for a Parisian cemetery at an earlier time. In 1787 Abbé Patry had published an essay on the establishment of four such extra-mural cemeteries.⁶⁷ He had suggested an enclosing wall around each of the four cemeteries, with a gallery where five hundred burial vaults could be built also allowing for individual graves in certain areas of the cemetery and some in the gallery area as well. The gallery area however was meant to especially prestigious, as at the Campo Santo, where it was reserved for the illustrious but Patry was less concerned with commemorating merit, than with fundamental questions of finance: an average of 400 of the vaults along the gallery would be for private individual use, and sold at 6,000 *livres* each, for a total of 9 million 600 *livres*, to be put towards the building and upkeep of the cemetery.⁶⁸ In 1791 again, Quatremère de Quincy suggested a similar plan for a cemetery, with a surrounding gallery reserved in part for the *grand homme* and, as he put it, monuments of friendship, gratitude and private sentiments.⁶⁹ Along with Mulot, a number of other contestants in 1799 and 1800 offered similar ideas. Grandjean's plan was bordered by plantation of trees interspersed with private tombs and in 1800 Ronesse and Pommereuil

⁶⁶Mulot, *Discours qui a partagé le prix*, Paris, an IX, p. 84

⁶⁷Abbé Patry, *Mémoire concernant l'établissement de quatre cimetières hors des murs de Paris*, Paris, 1787 (12 Juillet, 1787), A. N. F¹⁴ 187B

⁶⁸Patry, *Mémoire concernant l'établissement de quatre cimetières hors des murs de Paris*, Paris, 1787

⁶⁹, Quatremère de Quincy, 'Lettre de Quatremère de Quincy (Sur le Panthéon et les sépultures)', *Moniteur Universel*, No. 103, 13 April, 1791

suggested similar arrangements.⁷⁰ Given the long-standing popularity of the idea, it was not surprising that the Institut adopted it, concluding that in the new cemetery a pathway along the inside of the surrounding wall would be given over to individual plots where epitaphs could be attached to the walls.⁷¹

The cemetery was thus defined as a space for both the commemoration of the *grand homme* and of the ordinary individual, for the celebration of both public and private virtues, but clearly differentiated and distinguished from each other. Mulot had stressed the importance of defining the border between private sentiments and virtues to be fostered through individual monuments, and the public celebration of merit, and the Institut agreed with him. Epitaphs should be rigidly controlled so as not to transgress the boundaries of domestic eulogy and anything beyond the platitudes of good mother, loving father, beloved son or daughter could be construed as political and unacceptable. Only the government would have the right to distinguish the friends of the nation, military leaders and heroes in funerary monuments and epitaphs.

The results of the 1800 Institut contest were reflected in legislation and official publications that followed. The *Arrêté* of 21 ventôse, year IX (11 March, 1801) issued by the Prefect of the Seine,

⁷⁰Ronessse, *Projet pour les sépultures, ouvrage qui a concouru pour le prix proposé par l'Institut National, au nom du Gouvernement, sur cette question: Quelles sont les cérémonies à faire pour les funérailles, et le règlement à adapter pour le lieu de la sépulture?*, Paris, year IX, p. 26 and Pommereuil, *Mémoire sur les funérailles*, Paris and Tours, year IX, p. 28

⁷¹See Jean-Charles Désessartz, *Rapport fait par les citoyens Hallé, Désessartz, Toulangeon, Révellièrre-Lépauux [sic], Leblond et Camus, commissaires chargés par l'Institut National des sciences et des Arts de l'examen des mémoires envoyés aux concours proposé par le gouvernement, sur les questions relatives aux cérémonies funéraires et aux lieux des sépultures. Jugement porté par l'Institut et proclamation du prix*, Paris, n.d., p. 20

Nicholas-Thérèse-Benoist Frochot, decreed the establishment of three extra-mural cemeteries and guaranteed the concession of individual graves and the right to erect private monuments or mausoleums.⁷² The change in existing cemeteries such as Montmartre was quickly visible as the earliest recorded monuments were erected from this time on, such as that of Marshal Philippe-Henri, Marquis de Ségur, who died in 1801.⁷³ At least one visitor, in about 1808, found the result charming. Antoine Caillot in a *Voyage pittoresque et sentimental au Champ de Repos sous Montmartre et à la maison de campagne du Père Lachaise à Mont Louis*, described Montmartre as 'picturesque' and likened the experience to being transported to the 'bosquets of the Elysium', the setting chosen by the poets for the residence of happy souls.⁷⁴ The *Champs de Repos* did have its fair share of poets such as Jean François de Saint Lambert, who died in 1803 and Gabriel-Marie Legouvé, author of *La Sépulture*, who died in 1812, and Mme. du Bocage, who held one of the most well frequented Parisian Salons, and died in 1802, as well as other renowned figures.⁷⁵ For more ordinary mortals as well, abysmal anonymity had given way to individual monuments. Caillot described

⁷²See Henri Lemoine, 'Les Cimetières de Paris de 1760 à 1825', *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de Paris et l'Île de France*, 1924, p. 96

⁷³Hillairet, *Les 200 cimetières*, Paris, 1958, p. 317

⁷⁴Antoine Caillot, *Voyage pittoresque et sentimental au Champ de Repos sous Montmartre et à la maison de campagne du Père Lachaise à Mont Louis*, Paris, 1808, p. 15. On the other hand as Richard Etlin has pointed out there were those who found that the cemetery differed little from its predecessors. In 1802, the mayor of the first arrondissement wrote: 'This is not a cemetery, it is an abyss' and Napoleon was shocked by a glimpse of it in 1812. Etlin, *The Architecture of Death*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1984, p. 252

⁷⁵See Hillairet, *Les 200 cimetières*, Paris, 1958, pp. 317-318

'In front of the door at the edge of the field, is a small valley planted with poplars, cypresses and weeping willows, and whose surface is covered throughout with tombs, mausolea, pyramids and inscriptions that all announce the virtues of the deceased and the pain of those who composed them.'⁷⁶

The concept of the garden Elysium had been expanded to include the commemoration of ordinary individuals and of private, domestic virtues as well as public, national ones. The right of the moneyed classes to carve out their own histories, among the luminaries of the nation, in the cemetery museum had triumphed. In the company of the talents and achievements of great artists, the integrity, generosity and selflessness of Marie Pierre Joseph Thian (died 1805), a house painter, were engraved for posterity on his headstone by his family and friends. (ill. 17) While engravings portrayed the public visiting the notable figures in Lenoir's Elysium, at Montparnasse, in the bas-relief on his tomb - today the only remaining tomb from the original Champs de Repos - Jean André Larmoyer (died 1801), was depicted on his death bed surrounded only by his family. (ill. 18)

The publication of *Sépultures publiques et particulières* by authorization of the Minister of the Interior, year IX (Sep. 1801-Sep. 1802) reconfirmed this right of every individual to commemorate their loved ones in the manner of their choosing and laid out the manner in which burial, ceremonial and commemoration would be organized in the newly projected cemeteries. Individuals were given the freedom to opt

⁷⁶ 'En face de la porte, à l'extrémité du champs, est un petit vallon planté de peupliers, de cyprès et de saules pleureurs, et dont la surface est couverte dans toute son étendue, de tombes, de mausolés, de pyramides et d'inscriptions que toutes annoncent les vertus des morts et la douleur de ceux qui les ont dictées!' Caillot, *Voyage pittoresque et sentimental*, Paris, 1808, p. 18

for monuments, simple or grandiose, provided of course one could meet the cost, for the freedom to erect grandiose monuments depended on the ability to pay, and this financial aspect was to play an important role in the formulation of the new cemetery.

In 1800 Pommereuil had suggested a scheme where the sale of individual plots could pay for the cost of establishing the new cemeteries.⁷⁷ While sentiment, piety, morality and ideology had been essential issues of the debates of the previous decade or so, both for, and against individual monuments, the final official decision to allow for individual tombs, elaborate monuments and the re-establishment of bourgeois elitism, may have been based on just such an economic premise. The affirmation of the right of individuals to erect monuments outlined in *Sépultures* coincided with the inauguration of a special bureau to deal with the sale of individual plots in a cemetery that had not yet even been opened.⁷⁸ The concept of individual plots and the erection of private commemorative monuments was indeed necessary to the funding of the new cemetery and the administration in charge was effectively awaiting the purchase of at least five hundred individual plots before starting any work towards the realization of the scheme.⁷⁹ Moreover, while minimal burial in the common area was set at 50 francs and included a rudimentary coffin, transportation, some sort of marker and an epitaph, as soon as individuals desired any

⁷⁷Pommereuil, *Mémoire sur les funérailles*, Paris and Tours, year IX, p. 40

⁷⁸'L'Administration est établie Rue du Doyenné, sous l'arcade n° 293, près de la Rue St. Thomas-du-Louvre. Bureaux ouverts tous les jours 9-4pm...recourent soumissions de ceux qui veulent acquérir caveau ou tombeau.' *Sépultures publiques et particulières, La Piété naturelle commande le respect pour les Morts, un gouvernement sage le garantit, Par autorisation du Ministre de l'Intérieur*, year IX, (Sep. 1801-Sep 1802), Note, p. 20

⁷⁹'Titre second, Art V', *Sépultures publiques et particulières*, year IX

greater distinction, such as a private tomb, they had to be prepared to meet the cost. An individual tomb cost an extra 50 francs, and included a simple tombstone with an epitaph. An extra 10 percent was charged for engraving.⁸⁰ Anything more elaborate, such as a mausoleum, and the administration would fix a price according to the cost of erection. Furthermore the administration claimed a monopoly on engraving, construction, and decoration of tombs, both exterior and interior, thus establishing the safeguards against seditious monuments or inscriptions called for by Mulot and the Institut and at the same time ensuring the revenue necessary for the establishment and administration of the cemetery, the cost of erecting monuments to national heroes and of burying indigents in the communal graves.⁸¹ These financial considerations possibly explain why the small area devoted to private monuments by Mulot and the Institut report, limited to the periphery of the enclosure, was greatly enlarged to encompass most of the newly formulated cemetery.

While the formulation of the new cemetery at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century still maintained the notion of public Elysium in its preservation of the memory of famous figures, the establishment of the right of private individuals to commemorative monuments emerged as an equally essential aspect of the space. While the commemoration of the *grand homme* had been more clearly politically motivated, the decision to allow ordinary individuals the possibility of erecting monuments in the cemetery can likewise be seen as implicated in

⁸⁰'Titre premier: Sépultures publiques, Articles I-IV' and 'Titre Second: Prix des Tombeaux, Art I', *Sépultures publiques et particulières*, year IX

⁸¹'Titre cinquième: Des caveaux, Art. I-III', *Sépultures publiques et particulières*, year IX

changing contemporary politics, pointing to the reemergence of a powerful moneyed elite at the end of the century, and the desire to re-establish a stable social order, as well as a fundamental economic necessity for the funding of such a large scale public project. If the monarch and then the *grand homme* had been the focus of the cemetery projects throughout the Eighteenth Century, at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, it was the juxtaposition of the illustrious and the ordinary which gave meaning to the new cemetery and redefined both groups. We shall see that while the preservation of memory at the Pantheon was an officially orchestrated process, in the cemetery, famous figures would be for the most part commemorated, honoured and remembered by their family, friends, peers and public admirers.

Chapter Two

Separate Spaces, Separate Identities: Defining the *grand homme* at Père Lachaise

Père Lachaise, the first of the new cemeteries, did not actually open up until 1804, but its conception, format and organization reflected the issues debated throughout the 1790s and the results of the contests of 1799 and 1800. The decisions of year IX, outlined in the *Arrêté* of 3 March 1801, could not be implemented for several years as no suitable site had been found. The desire for a garden cemetery was reflected in this search as initially Frochot, the Prefect of the Seine, had sought authorization for the purchase of the Parc Monceau for the establishment of a cemetery.¹ The Parc Monceau site was especially appropriate as it had been the site of a fantastic, picturesque 'wood of tombs' created for the Duc de Chartres by Carmontelle in the Eighteenth Century.² Although Frochot's idea was never realized at the Parc Monceau, the purchase of ^{the} Mont Louis estate in 1803 offered an equally picturesque and verdant landscape upon which to plan a cemetery. The first burial took place 21 May, 1804 and in all 113 burials were said to have taken place that year, yet the design for the cemetery had not been worked out.³ It was not until 6

¹Frochot, Letter 8 Prairial, year IX. A. N. F¹³ II Seine 20. Cited in Richard Etlin, *The Architecture of Death, The Transformation of the Cemetery in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1984, p. 299

²Dora Wiebenson, *The Picturesque Garden in France*, Princeton, 1978, p. 92

³ *Paris and its Environs, Displayed in a Series of Picturesque Views from Original Drawings Taken Expressively for this Work, Comprising Views on the Seine, Churches, Palaces, Public Offices, Bridges, Aqueducts, Catacombs, Streets, Modern Improvements, etc.*, Drawings under the direction of A. Pugin, Esq., Engravings executed under the superintendence of Mr. C. Heath, Topographical and historical descriptions by L. T. Ventouillac (in French and English), London and Paris, vols. 1 and 2, 1829-1831, p. 74

March, 1805 that Frochot published his ideas for the definitive ordering of the cemetery in a decree, but his conception still very much reflected the issues thrashed out in the last decade and a half and largely summarized those set out in the Minister of the Interior's official publication, *Sépultures publiques et particulières* of year IX. Around 1810, the architect Alexandre-Théodore Brongniart (1738-1813) began the task of transforming the former estate into the functional cemetery envisaged by the Prefect, with improved access and circulation, grand entrance and central chapel and a plan that incorporated the concept of the complementary roles played by the illustrious and the ordinary. The *grand homme* was no longer singled out to the exclusion of the ordinary individual but still played a central role in the organization and meaning of Brongniart's designs, being set apart by the creation of special spaces of glory within the cemetery. Yet the notion of proximity to the ordinary individual was equally significant and this confraternity of illustrious and ordinary individuals meant that the boundaries of definition between the two groups could constantly shift. As at the Musée des Monuments, the definition of the *grand homme* in the cemetery, while still greatly linked to national image and pride, was wrested away from the exclusivity of official discernment and greatly enlarged to embrace figures that would traditionally have been excluded. For the wealthy, the bourgeois, monumental commemoration at Père Lachaise elevated their status closer to that of the *grand homme* and this relationship was illustrated by the very format of the cemetery as envisaged by Frochot and designed by Brongniart.

The Prefecture of the Seine's *Arrêté* of 6 March, 1805 outlined a cemetery, where in addition to the choice of a natural setting, there would be the possibility for both public and private commemoration, for the erection of monuments to both the illustrious and the ordinary and for the glorification of both merit and wealth. This was achieved by dividing the cemetery into three basic divisions, with four distinct modes of burial within the layout of the cemetery. The practice of communal burial for the poor was maintained as both an economic and spatial necessity, situated along the flat tracts of the estate, which were the most suitable for the long trenches required and were also separated from the location of other more desirable modes of burial. Temporary monuments were allowed, but as the graves were to be renewed every six years, they were only guaranteed a brief existence. For those of means, individual plots where monuments could be erected, could be purchased in two categories: *concessions temporaires*, plots purchased for a limited number of years at 50 francs for those of more modest means and for the wealthy, the coveted *concession perpétuelle*, plots purchased in perpetuity, which would be, for the time being, exclusive to Père Lachaise. The latter, permanent category could then be as large as the individual desired and could accommodate a variety of monument sizes. There were also two distinct types of *concessions à perpétuité* available.

The first type could be purchased at 100 francs per square metre, for the erection of either individual or family monuments (The price had already risen since the publication of *Sépultures*.) and could

therefore be conceivably as large as the purchaser desired.⁴ The second type of permanent plot reflected the long-standing desire to imitate the peristyle of the Campo Santo, and its surrounding gallery lined with elaborate monuments to illustrious citizens, an idea reiterated by contestants in 1799 and 1800, by the Institut report and adopted in *Sépultures*. Frochot's proposal outlined a surrounding peristyle and a plan to give away the plots in the gallery area as long as the purchasers guaranteed to build a portion of the projected uniform peristyle. Functional, aesthetic and ideological considerations were as in *Sépultures*, brought together by financial ones, with the desired majestic arcade built at practically no cost to the city.

It would seem however, that in order to 'sell' this idea, the image of the *grand homme* was necessary. Frochot's planned peristyle was backed by Quatremère de Quincy in his report to the Municipal Council of the city of Paris on the distribution of plots in the cemetery, with the suggestion that the city should build the first few arcades and set the desired style, and the Council agreed to the idea.⁵ If the impressiveness of the peristyle as a last resting place was not enough

⁴Frochot, *Prefecture du Departement de la Seine, Arrêté: Fait à Paris le 15 Ventôse, an XIII*, (6 March, 1805). Paris, year XIII, A.N. F² (I) 123

⁵'Il faut se figurer un vaste enclos, dont les terrains variés, couverts de pierre sépulchrales, de toutes espèces de signes funéraires, présenteront une succession de monumens de tous les âges, et deviendront pour la prospérité, une sorte d'histoire et de chronologie lapidaire. Il faut se figurer ce grand emplacement environné d'une galerie couverte en portiques, sous lesquels règneraient des caveaux destinés à l'inhumation des familles opulentes, qui auraient acheté toute l'étendue d'une arcade, ou à l'inhumation des hommes distingués, dont le gouvernement croirait devoir honorer la mémoire...Le Conseil général, faisant fonctions de Conseil Municipal de Paris, adhère aux vues exprimés et adopte la délibération proposé, 29 Germinal an 13, signés, Petit, Président, et Quatremère de Quincy, secrétaire.' Quatremère de Quincy, *Rapport fait au Conseil Municipal de la ville de Paris, par l'un de ses membres sur les concessions de terrains dans les cimetières*, Paris, 29 germinal year 13, (March 17, 1805), A.N. F² (I) 123, pp. 6-7

to lure prospective investors, then a clever publicity campaign might do the trick. Frochot had already indicated his hope to secure Lenoir's tombs of illustrious figures for this area in addition to contemporary figures singled out by the government for honour.⁶ Quatremère de Quincy encouraged the idea of enlisting the services of a number of the illustrious figures installed at the Museum of French Monuments, firmly believing that a few of these grand figures scattered about the peristyle would have the buyers flocking, and ensure the success of the cemetery as a whole.⁷

The success of the cemetery is now a matter of historical record and statistics and according to Marchant de Beaumont, by the end of 1827 alone, over 166,000 people had been buried at Père Lachaise.⁸ The plan seemed so successful, that one visitor, Mr. Carter, claimed that same year that:

'The income arising from the settled price of interments in Père Lachaise has been amply sufficient to defray the

⁶Frochot, *Prefecture du Departement de la Seine, Arrêté: Fait à Paris le 15 Ventôse, an XIII*, (6 March, 1805). Paris, year XIII, A.N. F² (I) 123

⁷'Il faudra qu'on érige les premières arcades de l'enceinte; ces épreuves même, pour produire tout leur effet, devraient se faire avec tous les accompagnements propres à compléter leur impression, et dans cette vue le Préfet se hâtera sans doute de revendiquer les restes de quelques hommes célèbres, qui, par suite des efforts révolutionnaires, se trouvent faire partie des curiosités de certains muséums, et n'y sont pas la curiosité la moins extraordinaire.'..Les causes qui ont fait entasser, dans ces dépôts de ruines, tant de monumens funéraires ayant cessé depuis longtemps, le préfet croira aussi qu'il est de son devoir de réclamer, pour l'intérêt des arts et pour le succès de la nouvelle institution, cette multitude de mausolées, qui doivent être l'héritage naturel et légitime des nouveaux cimetières.' Q. de Quincy, *Rapport*, Paris, 29 Germinal an 13, (March 17, 1805), A.N. F² (I) 123, p. 10

⁸Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire du curieux dans le cimetière du Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1828, p. 24

whole expense of the cemetery, without imposing any public tax upon the city.'⁹

Private enterprise also flourished as a result, as by this time there were about twenty marble workshops installed in the area around and leading to the cemetery, as well as metal workshops for iron railings and doors, and gardeners for plants and flowers.¹⁰

A closer look at the intervening years since the first burial on 21 May, 1804¹¹, however, reveals a less auspicious early period. While 113 burials took place in the Père Lachaise in all in 1804, most of these represent re-inhumations of corpses exhumed from the old Vaugirard cemetery which had recently closed.¹² According to Marchant de Beaumont, only 13 of these involved individual plots with monuments.¹³ This lack of sales and therefore funding may be the reason for the delay in landscaping the cemetery as Brongniart's contribution seems to have come some years after the cemetery had already opened. His plans for the Père Lachaise are not dated, but were probably produced around 1810, some six years after the opening of the cemetery.¹⁴

While only a few tombs were erected in 1804, we do not know the number of plots sold to individuals who were still living, or had not

⁹N.H. Carter, *Letters from Europe, Comprising the Journal of a Tour Through Ireland, England, Scotland, France, Italy and Switzerland, In the Years 1825, 1826, and 1827*, 2 vols., New York, 1827, vol. 1, p. 395

¹⁰Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire*, Paris, 1828, note 1, p. 51 and Karl Friedrich Schinkel, *Reise nach England, Schottland und Paris im Jahre 1826*, Gottfried Riemann and David Bindman, eds., Berlin, 1986, p. 68

¹¹Carter, *Letters from Europe*, New York, 1827, vol. 1, p. 396

¹²Patrick Bracco, 'Le Cimetière du Père Lachaise', *Les Monuments historiques de la France*, No. 124, December, 1982-January, 1983

¹³Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire*, Paris, 1828, p.43

¹⁴According to Patrick Bracco, 'Le Père Lachaise', *Alexandre Théodore Brongniart*, Paris, 1986, p. 295

yet erected monuments, but the extremely small numbers of monuments being erected in those early years gives us ample reason to think that the projected plan of action was not going that well.

According to Marchant de Beaumont the numbers of markers erected over the next few years, from simple headstones to larger monuments were as follows:

1805: 14 tombs

1806: 19

1807: 26

1808: 51

1809: 66

1810: 76

1811: 96

1812: 130

1813: 240

1814: 509

1815: 635

Total: 1,875 ¹⁵

It is not clear how many of these were temporary or perpetual concessions, but in relation to the subsequent well established fame of the cemetery, the numbers seem to rise almost too slowly and indicate an initial lack of popularity.

As Marchant de Beaumont wrote in 1822:

'For ten years after the opening, M. Brongniart could not see his work flourish...people change their habits slowly and especially their opinions about things for which they have up until that

¹⁵Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire*, Paris, 1828, p. 43

point felt a justified horror. For ten years the funerary enclosure at Père Lachaise, which they should have applauded, was simply perceived as a cemetery, a space of sadness that must be avoided.'¹⁶

One of the reasons for this lack of popularity was that, despite legislation dating back to the mid-Eighteenth Century, the traditional practice of burial in churches had not lost its hold on the public. Burial within church precincts had long been linked with salvation, and the belief that proximity to the altar, the relics of a saint would somehow increase one's chances could not be eradicated with simple legislative decrees. As Marchant de Beaumont pointed out:

'Cemeteries were opened near Paris; but their space, disdained by the least *bourgeois*, welcomed only the remains of the indigent. How could the ostentation of the wealthy resign itself to rot under a lawn beneath the sky's dome. A church vault, where one remained perhaps for only a short time, was for him, without a doubt, preferable in its darkness.'¹⁷

The Imperial Decree on Burials of 12 June, 1804 (23 Prairial, an XII) had restated the prohibition, but there were those who simply would

¹⁶'Pendant dix ans après l'ouverture, M. Brongniart n'a pas pu voire son oeuvre fleurir...le peuple change lentement d'habitudes et surtout d'opinions sur les objets pour lesquels il n'a jusqu'alors éprouvé qu'une juste horreur. Pendant dix ans l'enceinte funéraire du Père Lachaise, à laquelle il devait applaudir, ne fut devant ses yeux qu'un cimetière, lieu de tristesse qu'il fallait fuir.' Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire*, Paris, 1828, p.40

¹⁷'Des cimetières furent ouverts auprès de Paris; mais leur enceinte, dédaigné du moindre bourgeois, n'eut pour hôtes que les cadavres des indigents. Comment le faste d'un riche aurait-il pu se résoudre à pourrir sous la voûte du ciel, sous un gazon! Une cave d'église, où l'on restait peut-être bien peu de temps, était pour lui, sans nul doute préférable dans son obscurité. Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques, historiques et morales du cimetière du Père La Chaise, représentant ses aspects, ses sites, ses points de vue les plus magnifiques, les scènes les plus touchantes du culte rendu à la mémoire des morts, et quatre cents tombeaux...*, Paris, 1822, p. 95

not alter their practices and exceptions to the law were apparently frequent under the Empire and Restoration for the wealthy and the privileged.¹⁸ The law of 1804 had also made provisions for each individual's right to be buried on private property.¹⁹ Therefore, for the wealthy, the land owning, there were attractive alternatives to burial at Père Lachaise, but the indigent and the poor had no such choice in the matter.

Distance as well may have been an important factor in this initial ostracism of Père Lachaise. The cemetery was the first of the extra-mural cemeteries demanded since the mid-Eighteenth Century for reasons of hygiene and Michel Dansel has written that the Parisians were reluctant to be buried at Père Lachaise because of that very distance from the city.²⁰ Hygiene notwithstanding, Parisians were used to living in close proximity to the departed, and the move to Père Lachaise was a sort of exile. John M. Merriman's study of the margins of the city in France 1815-1851 seems to suggest there is some foundation to this idea, as the outskirts of the city, the netherland between countryside and urban centre, had historically been associated with pejorative images. The 'barrières' of the city were frightening places associated with prostitutes, beggars, criminals and other outcasts.²¹ Père Lachaise cemetery was located in just such a margin to

¹⁸Thomas A. Kselman, *Death and the Afterlife in Modern France*, Princeton, 1993, p. 177

¹⁹'Titre Premier: Art 14: Toute personne a la faculté de se faire enterrer sur sa propriété pourvu qu'elle soit à la distance prescrite de l'enceinte des villes et des bourgs'. *Decrét Impérial, 23 prarial, an XII*, (12 June, 1804) A.N. F¹⁹4379

²⁰Michel Dansel, *Au Père Lachaise, son histoire, ses secrets, ses promenades*, Paris, 1981, p. 23

²¹John M. Merriman, *The Margins of City Life, Explorations on the French Urban Frontier, 1815-1851*, New York and Oxford, 1991, p. 16

the east of Paris and inhumation within its precincts might be perceived as a marginalization from the city centre, friends and family. Philippe Ariès' study of the socio-cultural perception of death in the Nineteenth Century highlights a belief of death as primarily being a separation from loved ones, resulting in the development of a cult of tombs and increasing visits to the tomb as a means of maintaining those ties.²² In light of this, location on the margins of city life, the threat of ostracism, the fear of being forgotten and outcast would have represented a serious deterrent to burial at Père Lachaise.

As well as illustrating this initial lack of enthusiasm for erecting monuments at Père Lachaise, Marchant de Beaumont's figures listed above also show that the numbers were nonetheless growing steadily, if slowly, by 1815. The accuracy of de Beaumont's numbers may be questionable, as MM. Roger included over 2,000 monuments erected up until January 1816, in their guide to the cemetery, but then the discrepancy does not mitigate the appearance of a marked rise in the erection of monuments.²³ Certainly a large majority of these monuments would have been quite small and those illustrated by MM. Roger do tend to be simple headstones and moderate sized monuments, with few monumental tombs. According to official statistics, published in *Recherches statistiques sur la ville de Paris*, between 1821 and 1823,

²²Philippe Ariès, *Images of man and Death*, Janet Lloyd, trans., Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 1985, p. 243

²³MM. Roger, Père et fils, *Le Champs du Repos, ou le cimetière du Mont-Louis, dit du Père Delachaise, ouvrage orné de Planches, représentant plus de 200 Mausolées érigés dans ce cimetière depuis sa création jusqu'au 1er janvier 1816, avec leurs épitaphes, son plan topographique, tel qu'il existait du temps du Père Delachaise, et tel qu'il existe aujourd'hui, précédé du portrait de ce jésuite, d'un abrégé de sa vie, et suivi de quelques remarques sur la manière dont différents peuple honorent les défunts, auquel on a ajouté l'Élégie de Thomas Gray, l'imitation libre de cet élégie mise en vers français et celle italienne de Torelli*, 2 vols., Paris, 1816

the number of monuments erected at Père Lachaise, on a variety of scales, was as high as 13, 324.²⁴ These numbers reflect the general upswing in sheer number of monuments being erected after 1815, where the total according to Marchant de Beaumont had only been as high as 635. Even given certain discrepancies, the average number of monuments erected only 6 to 8 years later, between 1821 and 1823 was significantly higher, at an average of 4,441 per year. Marchant de Beaumont's assertion that in 1828 there were now some 30,000 tombs at Père Lachaise, while a great advance on the 2,000 accounted for by MM. Roger in 1816, seems quite plausible.²⁵

The increased popularity of the cemetery was likewise reflected in the appearance of the above mentioned guidebooks which described both the larger tombs and the tombs of famous figures. As early as 1814, C. P. Arnaud began publishing a series of descriptions of tombs which was eventually assembled into a *Receuil des tombeaux des quatre cimetières de Paris, avec leurs épitaphes et leurs inscriptions*, published in two volumes in 1817 and 1825 and illustrated with 42 engraved plates, in which Père Lachaise featured prominently as well as being singled out among the other cemeteries by the addition of a topographical map. In 1816 MM. Rogers published *Le Champs du repos, ou le cimetière Mont-Louis, dit du Père Lachaise* and in 1821

²⁴Statistics reprinted in Kselman, *Death and the Afterlife in Modern France*, Princeton, 1993, p. 185. It is interesting to compare the number of monuments erected in those years with the statistics listed by de Beaumont for burials between 1821 and 1823: 30,432 burials, an average of 10,144 per year. Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire*, Paris, 1828, p. 23

²⁵Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire*, Paris, 1828, p. VI

Marchant de Beaumont began publishing his successful, often re-edited, series of books on the cemetery.²⁶

Moreover, it was the type of monument that was in transition. While monumental tombs had been rare in MM. Roger's publication, larger tombs were also on the increase proportionately. Official statistics had organized the monuments erected between 1821 and 1823 by category, according to size and price. Small tombs valued at 100 francs or less were still superior in numbers at 11,898, but the larger tombs were becoming increasingly popular. 508, medium sized tombs, valued at 100 to 1,000 francs, 814 large tombs costing 1,000 to 3,500 francs and ¹⁰⁴very large tombs at 3,500 to 35,000 francs were erected.²⁷

Michel Dansel has attributed this transformation in attitudes to Père Lachaise to an 'extraordinary publicity campaign'.²⁸ On 28 February, 1817, the Prefect of the Seine issued an *Arrêté* ordering the transfer of the tombs of Molière, La Fontaine, Héloïse and Abélard from Lenoir's Elysium Garden at the Museum of French Monuments to Père Lachaise, an idea the Prefect Frochot and Quatremère de Quincy had expressed several years earlier and which was intended to attract potential customers to build and fund a portion of the projected peristyle.²⁹ Molière and La Fontaine were transferred on 6 March

²⁶Marchant de Beaumont's *Manuel et itinéraire du curieux dans le cimetière du Père Lachaise*, was, for example, in its third edition by 1828.

²⁷Reprinted in Kselman, *Death and the Afterlife in Modern France*, Princeton, 1993, p. 185

²⁸Michel Dansel, *Les Cimetières de Paris, promenade insolite, pittoresque et capricieuse*, Paris, 1987, p. 53 and *Au Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1981, p. 23

²⁹Alexandre Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français, ou Description historique et chronologique des statues en marbre et en bronze, bas-reliefs et tombeaux des hommes et des femmes célèbres, pour servir à l'histoire de France et celle de*

1817 and on the 16 June the remains of Héloïse and Abélard were moved from the Museum of French Monuments as well, stopping off at the church of Saint-Germain des Près, where a service was celebrated for the eternal rest of their souls, cleansing away the unsavoury aura of their stay in the unconsecrated museum garden. Only then were they transferred to Père Lachaise to await the reconstruction of Lenoir's monument.³⁰ As discussed in Chapter One, the figures of Molière, La Fontaine, Héloïse and Abélard were popular celebrities and as a result they may have attracted more attention than the image of a traditional *grand homme* ever could have, the latter's work and achievements often being more divorced from the popular imagination. This was demonstrated to some degree by the particular kind of attention that the new celebrities at Père Lachaise generated. In particular, the tomb of Abélard and Héloïse, rather than spurring through emulation the production of great spiritual texts such as Abélard had produced, it was the story of the lovers that appealed to the romantic imagination of the visitor. The monument was completely re-erected at Père Lachaise by November 6, 1817³¹, and it quickly became a landmark of the cemetery and the site of pilgrimage for amorous couples in particular. Engravings of the period often represented these couples gazing wistfully at the medieval couple, separated in life, but reunited in death, at Père Lachaise. (Illustration 8)

l'Art, 8 vols., Paris, 1800-1821, vol. 8, pp. 171-2. For Quatremère de Quincy's proposal for transferring some illustrious remains to the cemetery, see note 7.

³⁰ Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français, ou Description historique et chronologique des statues en marbre et en bronze, bas-reliefs et tombeaux des hommes et des femmes célèbres, pour servir à l'histoire de France et celle de l'Art*, 8 vols., Paris, 1800-1821, vol. 8, pp. 171-172 and *Moniteur Universel*, No. 171, 20 Juin, 1817 and No. 173, 22 Juin, 1817

³¹ *Moniteur Universel*, No. 311, 7 November, 1817

The transfers from the Museum were however only part of the changes at Père Lachaise responsible for increasing the cemetery's status and popularity. Since about 1810, Brongniart's designs were subtly transforming the cemetery into a vast outdoor Elysium. Brongniart had taken on board the concept of an Arcadian Elysium and garden cemetery, which he had shared with his contemporaries and friends, which included Delille and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre. The architect already had some experience designing private gardens, and some of these may have influenced his designs for the cemetery, particularly his work at Mauperthuis for the Marquis de Montesquiou, where he designed among other buildings and monuments, a sarcophagus for the remains of the Huguenot Gaspard de Coligny, who had been killed during the Massacre of St. Bartholomew.³² Presented with a ready-made landscaped estate, Brongniart chose to retain the effect of a natural setting as much as possible by avoiding the dominating architecture of the 1799 contest, where nature was represented by spare orderly plantations, as in a formal garden, and opted instead for spare architecture that blended into nature like the follies, temples and ruins popular in the English style garden. It would seem, that in the war between architecture and nature, as Richard Etlin puts it, nature triumphed and Père Lachaise would therefore have been first and foremost designed as 'a picturesque landscape garden'³³, but this view of the cemetery, where the only focus seems to be the natural setting occludes another main factor of Brongniart's design. Two

³²Dora Wiebenson, *The Picturesque Garden*, Princeton, 1978, p. 331 and *Jardins de France, 1760-1820*, Caisse Nationale des monuments historiques, Paris, 1977

³³Richard Etlin, *The Architecture of Death, The Transformation of the Cemetery in Eighteenth-century Paris*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1984, p. 303

watercolour plans for the cemetery from around 1810, preserved in the collection of the Carnavalet Museum in Paris, clearly reveal the balance between the public and private function of the cemetery, between the position of the illustrious and the ordinary individual. (ills. 19 and 20) The idea of the peristyle was incorporated into the plans, as it is visibly marked along most of the cemetery's perimeter and one of the designs even shows a small illustration of what a section would look like. (ill. 21) These galleries were never built, but their ideological basis, the importance of commemorating the *grand homme*, was nevertheless implanted firmly onto the rest of the design as the ideological and financial focus on the *grand homme* in the cemetery emerged in the physical mapping out of the space.

Brongniart designed a circular carriage-way around a large portion of the grounds, thus enabling him to link a very irregular piece of land. At important intersections of this circular road with the main axial routes leading back to a projected pyramidal central monument or chapel on the site of the old Mont-Louis mansion (ills. 61 and 62), Brongniart initially arranged three *ronds-points* destined to receive 'Monuments de marque', monuments or mausoleums which served a dual function. (ills. 22 and 23) Firstly they created interesting points of view and reference, as two *ronds-points* helped to link the layout of the peripheral road with the central chapel, while a third monument was planned at an awkward junction, where the circular peripheral road straightened out along the uppermost section of the property. Secondly they were to be dedicated to illustrious individuals, no doubt to be selected solely by official decree. Official commemoration of illustrious individuals had recently been a troublesome task as political

vicissitudes could make permanent costly projects problematic. For example, Mirabeau and Marat had been pantheonized, only to have their honour reversed just a few years later. This is perhaps why the *ronds-points* allocated to illustrious figures were to remain empty for a number of years until a quasi-official monument to Prime Minister Casimir P  rier was erected by public subscription between 1832 and 1837. A second *rond-point* was allocated only in 1906, not to an individual, but to the municipal workers of the city of Paris. The third *rond-point* situated along the uppermost section of the property was never even fully laid out.

Brongniart's plan, while focusing on the *grand homme*, was equally conscious of the importance of the position of the moneyed classes and the desire for monumental private commemoration and indeed the complimentary role played by these two groups. On his plan he also depicted a small Gothic chapel he had designed for the Greffuhle family and positioned just a little further down along this avenue from one of the *ronds-points*. (ill. 24) All along the periphery, the galleries - traditionally the sanctum of the illustrious as at the Campo Santo at Pisa- though never built, were earmarked on the plan as small chapels for private use. Private monuments were not only permitted in the new cemetery but allowed almost the same status and prominence as those of the illustrious, creating a link between the significance of the publicly honoured figure and that of the private individual within the same space. It is of interest that out of all the

monuments Brongniart had planned, the Greffulhe mausoleum was the only one begun during his lifetime.³⁴

Brongniart's projects for monuments to illustrious figures in the allocated *ronds-points* were stalled but the privileged position of the illustrious was quickly asserted throughout the rest of the cemetery. The nature of this commemoration and the definition of the *grand homme* in special spaces was however different than that for the *Monuments de marque*. To begin with, they had more in common with private commemorations as they were not essentially official. Brongniart had retained two of the groves from the former estate in his designs and focused his plans on the organized distribution of the tombs they were to contain and it may well have been his intention that they serve as particularly important spaces of commemoration, reserved for illustrious figures. The groves did indeed quickly develop into significant spaces of commemoration, even to the point of being organized to include figures who, placed together, seemed to form some sort of coherent group or school of thought. These relatively secluded areas were however privately organized, the result of collective commemorative projects, rather than a single official imperative. The individuals were selected for the honour by their peers, family and friends, who might join them there later, pointing to a self-formulating process of commemoration and of defining the concept of the *grand homme*.

³⁴The chapel was started under Brongniart's supervision but according to MM. Roger, it was still in the midst of construction in 1816 and he failed to see it completed. See MM. Roger, Père et fils, *Le Champs du Repos*, Paris, 1816, vol. 1, p. 124

One of these groves leads off directly to the right of the main building. (see Map 1) On Brongniart's plans a small alley lined with rows of trees leads to a dark square at one end, indicating the location of a tomb, the focal point of the space, privileged among the privileged. (ill. 19 and 20) On May 1, 1813, the poet and translator of Virgil, Jacques Delille died and he became the candidate for the place of pre-eminent merit among the meritorious at the culmination of the grove, which would become known as the *Bosquet Delille*. (ills. 25 and 26) Brongniart's friendship with Delille may have had something to do with it even though there is no proof that the architect himself chose the precise location of the poet's tomb. Nonetheless, the circumstances surrounding Delille's position there point to the site as a particularly glorious one.

In April 1810 the Institut had decided that it would take over the funeral arrangements for all of its members to ensure that they would be conducted in an appropriate manner. A budget of one thousand francs was allocated for financing the procession, carriages and so forth, as well as the purchase of a cemetery plot and a simple marble headstone. Père Lachaise was the only Parisian cemetery which offered the coveted *concession à perpétuité* and this made it the Institut's natural choice.³⁵ The erection of monuments there offered a sense of permanency to the act of commemoration in opposition to the ephemeral nature of the festivals and ceremonial of the post-revolutionary years. At the time Delille was perhaps one of the Institut's most distinguished members and in addition to the prestige

³⁵*Institut de France, Arrêté concernant les funérailles des membres de l'Intitut*, Paris, 1810

of permanent commemoration, the grove site offered the possibility of transformation into a symbol of great status.

At his death, Delille was considered by many as one of the greatest representatives of France's poetic glory. The funeral ceremonies were grandiose and theatrical. Delille's wife had the body embalmed and exhibited, crowned in laurel wreaths, for three days in the great room at the *Collège de France*, where his admirers came to pay homage.³⁶ The nation itself seemed in general mourning and the poet's funeral on May 6, 1813, took on the aspect of a public event as members of the Institut, professors, men of letters, students and numerous other admirers accompanied Delille to his final resting place. Delille's students paid him the ultimate form of homage by carrying his coffin to the church, as had been the practice in antiquity. His contemporaries compared him with some of the greatest literary figures of the past as in the eulogy by Pierre-François Tissot which pointed to similarities with Virgil, and predicted the long standing renown of the poet would be equaled by that of Delille.³⁷ He even likened the poet's features in death to those of Homer and Voltaire.³⁸ Delille's funeral was held in the church of Saint Étienne-du-Mont, which, Tissot was later to point out, was close to the location of the

³⁶See François-Marie Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques*, Paris, 1822, p.292 and Pierre-François Tissot, *Oeuvres de Delille, précédés d'une notice sur sa vie et ses ouvrages*; Pierre-François Tissot, ed., vols 1-10, Paris, 1832-33, vol. 1, 1832, pp. LV-LVI

³⁷'...le laurier qui suivit au mausolée Virgile reçoit encore le culte d'une admiration passionné...Combien les destinées de ce grand poète ont de ressemblance avec les tiennes!' Discours Tissot in C.-P. Arnaud, *Recueil des tombeaux des quatre cimetières de Paris, avec leurs épitaphes et leurs inscriptions*, vols. 1, 2, Paris, 1817, 1825, vol. 1, 1817, p. 38

³⁸Tissot, *Oeuvres de Delille*, Paris, vol. 1, 1832, p. LV

remains of Voltaire and Rousseau.³⁹ At the funeral, Delambre, professor of anatomy at the *Collège de France*, called him the 'the poet of France'.⁴⁰ Tissot claimed that not only would France mourn Delille's passing, but so would all of Europe.⁴¹

In 1813, at least according to his students, peers and fans, Delille was *grand homme* material. Yet as the comparisons with Voltaire and Rousseau painfully reminded one, Delille was not pantheonized. In retrospective it is perhaps easier now to see that Delille's accomplishments were not equal to the illustrious figures of history he was compared to, but by 1822, Marchant de Beaumont, author of numerous guidebooks to the cemetery, was already acknowledging that despite having been one of the first poets of his time, Delille could not come close the best poets of the time of Louis XIV or XV. However, even in his second-rate position he had been the only figure of glory in French poetry in a century so far sterile of talent.⁴² The Institut's participation lent an official air to the commemoration, the city of Paris offered a plot free of charge and a public subscription was very successful in raising funds for a monument.⁴³ Nonetheless this was far from a great national act of recognition, such as involved in the process of pantheonization, and ultimately it was Delille's family, peers and friends who made the decisions.

The monument is said to have been designed by Brongniart who died shortly after Delille on June 6, 1813. There would have been little

³⁹Tissot, *Oeuvres de Delille*, Paris, vol. 1, 1832, p. LV-LVI

⁴⁰See Arnaud, *Receuil des tombeaux*, Paris, vol. 1, 1817, p. 8

⁴¹Arnaud, *Receuil des tombeaux*, Paris, vol. 1, 1817, p. 46

⁴²Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques*, Paris, 1822, p.276

⁴³N. Paul-Albert, *Histoire du Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1937, pp. 224-5

time to finalize the project, and no drawings by Brongniart of the tomb are known.⁴⁴ However, the designing of such a small monument would hardly have necessitated a great deal of time and it is quite possible that Brongniart did draw up the plans. Quite a number of writers at the time claimed that he did, including Arnaud, in his *Receuil de tombeaux* written shortly thereafter.⁴⁵ In any case it was the architect Philippon who executed the tomb, which is of a simple and restrained nature, in the form of a classical sarcophagus, and bearing a resemblance to the tombs designed by Lenoir some years earlier for Descartes and Mabillon. Delille's tomb however is almost bare of sculptural decoration and therefore does not in itself bear any reference to his works, achievements or character, as did many of Lenoir's creations. Only two lachrymatory vases decorate the facade on either side of a marble plaque inscribed in gold letters solely with the name Jacques Delille, giving, with the traditional sarcophagus form, a proper funerary note to the structure. Despite its restrained character, it is nonetheless a large mausoleum, dominating the entire grove and Delille's position there is one of authority, one that is clearly meant as a grandiose form of commemoration.

While in 1813 Père Lachaise could be construed as a type of Elysium, it was not one controlled by official political ideology. Instead the formation of identity and the formulation of the notion of Elysium were produced by self-interested groups. In particular, as the architect of this space, Brongniart can be seen as consciously striving for the

⁴⁴Patrick Bracco, 'Le Père Lachaise', *Alexandre-Théodore Brongniart, 1739-1813: Architecture et décor*, Musée Carnavalet 22 Avril-13 Juillet, 1986, Paris, 1986, p.298

⁴⁵Arnaud, *Receuil des tombeaux*, Paris, vol. 1, 1817, p. 48

formation of a space of glory, a space where the location and setting themselves were of particular significance and meaning to a group of individuals which he perceived himself as belonging to. Brongniart himself was buried in the grove among them, provoking the question of whether or not this space was partially a self-interested creation. The establishment of such a space guaranteed that any individual buried there would share in a collective aura, belong to a collectively defined identity, which in this case involved notions of temporal and aesthetic affinity, rooted in an eighteenth-century cult of sentiment.

In the years following Delille's death, a number of tombs were erected in the shade of the double row of trees lining the processional approach to his mausoleum. Brongniart had died only a month after Delille on 6 June, 1813 and was buried to the left of the poet. Other architects soon followed, including Bélanger in 1818, one of Brongniart's students, and Maximilien Joseph Hurtault in 1824. (ill. 27) All aspects of achievement seemed to be represented over the years, with the history painter and student of Vien, François-André Vincent in 1816 (ill. 28), the famous tragic actor Talma, who was placed at other end of the avenue, opposite Delille after his death in 1826, his fellow actress Marie Hélène Bourgoïn, who died in 1833, the geographers Mentelle in 1815 and Barbié du Bocage in 1820, and the composer Lesueur in 1837. The writers were also present, with Louis-Sébastien Mercier (1781- 1814), author of *Tableaux de Paris* and *An 2440*, among other things and the poet, historian and critic, Pierre-Louis Ginguené (1748-1816), now long forgotten (ill. 29). An increasing number of poets and writers of nature surrounding Delille eventually created a small representation of the eighteenth-century

sentimental poetic school. The poets Chénier, in 1811, Bernardin de Saint Pierre and Évariste Parny in 1814, were buried in the grove, but not along the processional avenue. In accordance with Delille's own wishes that his friends be buried near him, in 1815, the poet Stanislas Jean, Chevalier de Boufflers, whom Delille had dubbed 'the most honourable of knights, the flower of the troubadours'⁴⁶ was buried within the enclosure of Delille's own tomb and commemorated by an urn on a small column. (ills. 25 and 26) In addition, in 1837 when work was carried out in the cemeteries of Vaugirard and Montmartre, the tombs of the poet De La Harpe and the playwright Saint Lambert were transferred to Père Lachaise and laid to rest nearby as well.⁴⁷

At the Chevalier de Bouffler's funeral in 1815, the Comte de Ségur claimed that in just a few years France had lost her most illustrious artists, and they were reunited, here, in the grove.⁴⁸ A publication of 1826 reiterated the concept of the grove as having gathered together the representatives of a cultural epoch asking : 'By what remarkable contrivance does this sepulchral area seem to reunite

⁴⁶François-Gabriel-Théodore Basset deJolimont, *Les Mausolées français, ou Recueil des tombeaux les plus remarquables, élevées dans le nouveaux cimetières de Paris, considérés sous le rapport de leur structure, de leurs épigraphes et des personnages qu'ils renferment, dessinés, lithographiés et decrits par Jolimont*, Paris, 1823

⁴⁷'Que mes amis viennent reposer auprès de moi, ou, qu'à défaut de leurs cendres une pierre rappelle leur souvenir', in N. Paul-Albert, *Histoire du Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1937, pp.226 and 245

⁴⁸'La mort, depuis quelques temps, éteint avec rapidité les plus éclatantes lumières de l'Académie, et nous enlève les plus riches ornements de la France littéraire. En peu de mois nous avons perdu Delille, Bernardin de Saint Pierre, Parny, et nous conduisons aujourd'hui au tombeau M. de Boufflers. Ah! combien de grand talents sont renfermés dans cette étroite et funeste enceinte!' Comte de Ségur, *Institut Royal de France, Funérailles de M. le marquis de Boufflers*, 23 janvier, 1815, n.d., p. 1

and bring together great men who were contemporaries?'⁴⁹ The grove had clearly emerged as a space that reflected the character, achievements and aspirations of an age that was perceived as slipping away, but also as a reflection of the concerns of a particular interest group. The fact that almost all of the figures in the grove were members of the Institut, including Barbié du Bocage, Chénier, Delille, Boufflers, Guinguené, Hurtault, Mentelle, Mercier and Vincent, was no coincidence. If the Institut had officially designated Père Lachaise in general as the preferred burial space for its members since 1810, the grove in particular was also a deliberate choice.

In 1811, at Chénier's funeral, Arnault, speaking for the Institut, had pointed to 'this enclosure which we have selected for our final reunion'.⁵⁰ In 1815, at Boufflers' funeral the sentiment was reiterated by the Comte de Ségur, who claimed an antique precedent for this use of the grove: 'this funerary space...becomes for us as well the unique image of those gardens of the academy in antiquity, where the most eloquent orators, the most charming poets and the most illustrious philosophers were reunited.'⁵¹ The concept of reunion was not necessarily linked to a belief in an afterlife but perhaps more to a notion of immortality through the perpetuation of memory. While overall the architecture and sculpture of the monuments gathered

⁴⁹'Mais par quelle combinaison remarquable cette région sépulchrale semble-t-elle réunir ou rapprocher des grands hommes qui furent contemporains?' G.G., *Promenade sérieuse au Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1826, p. 25

⁵⁰'...cette enceinte que notre choix a indiqué pour nôtre dernière réunion!' Arnault, *Institut de France, Funérailles de M. de Chénier, le 12, janvier, 1811*, n.d., pp. 7-8

⁵¹'...ce funèbre lieu...devient aussi pour nous la seule image de ces jardins de l'académie antique, où se trouvaient réunis les orateurs les plus éloquents, les poètes les plus aimables, et les philosophes les plus illustres.' Comte de Ségur, *Institut Royal de France, Funérailles de M. le marquis de Boufflers, 23 janvier, 1815*, n. d., p. 1

there was spare, and often devoid of symbolic representations of individual achievement, the space in itself, the sheer numbers of illustrious figures and their proximity guaranteed a sort of immortal renown. Indeed while each one of these figures might have been lost in the foray of history based on their own achievements alone, there was safety in numbers. Moreover, even within this Institut gathering, affinities were greater between some figures in relation to others, creating a continuous, complex layer of meanings within the grove itself. For example, Delille, Boufflers, La Harpe and Saint Lambert had all been friends and disciples of Voltaire.⁵² Parny and Ginguené had pursued their studies together and both produced early in their careers a particular type of elegiac poetry classed as *poésie érotique*.⁵³ Affinities and links were also reflected in the picturesque setting of the grove itself, which embodied to a large degree the spirit of work of Delille, Bernardin de Saint Pierre, Boufflers and Brongniart for example.

Delille's tomb itself, situated within a relatively large area, surrounded by a carefully manicured lawn and scented flowers, was a sort of sanctuary of meditation, where six wooden stools or seats offered the visitor rest, a floor covered with velour carpeting, and an altar decorated with a gilded bronze Christ and other suitable accessories. Before the altar stood two oak coffins, one with the remains of Delille and the other destined for his widow.⁵⁴ This

⁵²Viennet, *Promenade philosophique au cimetière du Père La Chaise*, Paris, 1855, p. 73

⁵³Pierre Larousse, *Grand dictionnaire universel du dix-neuvième siècle*, vols. 1-17, Paris, 1864-1886, vol. 12, 1874, p. 312

⁵⁴Yet another ceremony celebrating the inauguration of the tomb, and Delille's truly being laid to rest was accompanied by numerous artists, friends, and litterati. Tissot delivered an oration. See Arnaud, *Receuil des tombeaux*, vols. 1-2, Paris, 1817-1825, vol. 1, 1817, pp. 32 and 47

atmosphere extended to the rest of the grove itself. Views of the grove showed a green, shaded enclosure, with seating welcoming visitors to pause and take in the picturesque surroundings. (ill. 25) An engraving included in one of Marchant de Beaumont's publications shows one visitor leaning on a tree nearby, book in hand, reading poetry perhaps, or even about Delille in de Beaumont's own guidebook?⁵⁵ (ill. 30) The picturesque location, in nature, quiet meditation and contemplation were the hallmarks of the elegiac poetry practiced by the likes of Bernardin de Saint Pierre, Delille and Boufflers.

Delille's poetry had often glorified the notion of the tomb in nature. In *Imagination*, a poem dedicated to his wife, Delille had asked for such a final resting place:

'Écoute donc, avant de me fermer les yeux,...
 Je te l'ai dit, au bout de cette courte vie
 ma plus chère espérance et ma plus douce envie
 C'est de dormir au bord d'un clair ruisseau,
 À l'ombre d'un vieux chêne ou d'un jeune arbrisseau;...

Dans le repos des champs place mon humble tombe
 Tu n'y pourra graver ces titres solonnels
 Qui survivront aux morts, et qu'au sein des ténèbres
 Emporte dans l'horreur des caveaux funèbres
 L'incorrigible orgueil des fragiles mortels'⁵⁶

⁵⁵Marchant de Beaumont, 'Sixième vue', *Vues pittoresques*, Paris, 1822

⁵⁶'Before closing my eyes, listen/ My last wish and my final farewell/ I have told you, at the end of this short life/ my fondest wish and my greatest desire/ Is to sleep on the banks of a clear stream/ In the shadow of an old oak and a young sapling...Place my tomb in the peaceful fields/ You will not be able to engrave upon it those formal titles/ That survive the dead, and which in the heart of darkness/ Carries into the horror of the funeral vaults/ The hopeless vanity of

The grove itself was even more appropriate in its similarity to the description in what was perhaps Delille's best known poem, *Les Jardins*:

'Au fond de ce bosquet, vers ce lieu retiré,
J'avance, et je découvre un débris plus sacré....
Voyez ce mausolée, où le bouleau pliant,
.....vient pleurer sur la tombe' (Chant I 252-260)⁵⁷

This was the setting adopted by engravings of the period which typically showed Delille's tomb in the shadow of the trees, branches bending over to form a cool canopy. Brongniart himself would have been well acquainted with Delille's work, as a friend, but also because *Les Jardins* was part of the poet's claim to fame, having been reprinted and translated numerous times since its first publication. It is therefore quite plausible that when Brongniart designed the grove he had Delille's work in mind, and had furthermore intended that dark square at the end of the grove for Delille's appropriate, final resting place.

The Chevalier de Boufflers' burial in the Delille enclosure was likewise not only a symbol of the friendship between the two men, but also of a shared poetic ideal that extolled nature and the picturesque. Bernardin de Saint Pierre, companion of Rousseau, author of *Études de la nature*, had also glorified the notion of the tomb in nature in his prose. His tomb and its location were like Delille's appropriate in character and location. In *Études*, de Saint Pierre claimed that 'one does not need, in order to render these monuments commendable,

fragile mortals', Jacques Delille, 'Imagination' in *Oeuvres de Delille*, Tissot, ed., Paris, vol. VIII, 1832, pp.3- 4

⁵⁷'At the end of this grove, towards that remote place/ I advance, and I discover a more sacred ruin.../Look at that mausoleum, where the birchtree bends,/...come shed a tear on the tomb.' *Oeuvres de Delille*, Tissot, ed., Paris, vol, VII, 1833, p. 31

marbles, bronzes and gilding. The simpler they are, the more they inspire the feeling of melancholy...It is particularly in the countryside that their impression is vividly felt.'⁵⁸ Bernardin de Saint Pierre's tomb was indeed just a simple slab, tucked off to the side of the grove.

When Brongniart passed away on June 6, 1813 he too was buried in the grove, along the processional approach to the left of Delille. (see ill. 25) Again, while this in itself represented an honour, by including him in a privileged space which seemed almost tacitly reserved for Institut members, the picturesque setting was both personally and aesthetically significant. The picturesque grove recalled his work at Mauperthuis, with its fantastic follies, pyramids and the cenotaph to Admiral Coligny dotted across the landscape. On a personal level, the grove was especially appropriate as a final resting place for the architect, and other members of his family who eventually joined him there, because it was located within a space of his own design, but also because it recalled a similar project that Brongniart's father-in-law, M.-B. Hazon had planned on his estate. Towards the end of his life Hazon began to design a 'religious grove', a garden dotted with tombs, exedra and benches, as a final resting place for himself, his family and close friends.⁵⁹ In planning the groves Brongniart may have had Hazon's project in mind and the establishment of a similar space for himself and his family. However, in such a publicly visible and accessible space as Père Lachaise, the significance of such a gesture was considerably

⁵⁸'Il ne faut pas pour rendre recommandables ces monuments, des marbres, des bronzes, des dorures. Plus ils sont simples, plus ils donnent d'énergie au sentiment de la mélancholie...C'est surtout à la campagne que leur impression se fait vivement sentir.' Jacques Henri Bernardin de Saint Pierre, *Études de la nature*, 3 vols., Paris, 1784, vol. 3, p. 125

⁵⁹*Jardins de France, 1760-1820*, Paris, 1977

enlarged from a private act of mourning and remembrance into a public act of glorification and commemoration.

Brongniart's tomb was one of the few in the grove whose decoration made specific reference to his achievements. (ill. 31) In addition to the traditional funerary symbols, such as a sepulchral lamp, an hourglass and a garland of cypress and immortals between two torches, a female mourner, represents Architecture mourning a great loss, and a bas-relief of the facade of the new Bourse refers to Brongniart's most prominent work. In their 1816 guide, MM. Roger claimed that Brongniart had designed his own tomb, but there is reason to believe it was actually designed by his fellow architect Hippolyte Lebas.⁶⁰ Nonetheless, it underlines that the function of glorifying great achievements was now being organized privately, by the individuals themselves, their families and peers, a function that had throughout the 1790's been argued as the inherent monopoly of the government.

The formation of subsets of identity within the context of a carefully evoked eighteenth-century ambiance was further illustrated by the emergence of a caucus of musicians, conductors, singers, composers and even a piano maker, in the area surrounding Delille's tomb, both on the coveted processional avenue and around its opposite side. The entrance to Delille's mausoleum did not actually face the processional approach along which the tombs of Brongniart et. al. were aligned. Rather it faced the path on the other side of the grove, and it was opposite this entrance that the musician Grétry was buried later in

⁶⁰MM. Roger, Père et fils, *Le Champs du Repos*, Paris, 1816, vol. 2, note 1, p. 32 and *Monumens funéraires choisis dans les cimetières de Paris et des principales villes de France, dessinés, gravés et publiés par Normand, Fils, Graveur et éditeur de l'Arc de Triomphe des Tuileries, érigé en 1806, sur les dessins de MM. Pericier et Fontaine, 27 planches avec descriptions de M. Brès*, Paris, 1832, Plate 61.

1813. (ills. 32a and 32b) The immense crowds that had accompanied Delille upon his final journey to the Père Lachaise was equaled by Grétry's procession on Sep. 27 1813 and in many ways it resembled the pantheonization procession of Voltaire. A number of musicians with instruments preceded the carriage playing one of Grétry's marches. The procession stopped in front of the capital's most important theatres, paid homage before the Academy of music and only then followed on to the church for a mass. From there it crossed Paris to end up at Père Lachaise.⁶¹ Grétry's fellow musician Méhul eulogized him as the 'Molière of lyrical comedy'.⁶² One writer recorded that as his coffin was being lowered into the ground, the sun was setting, and more than one spectator remarked that two shining stars were being extinguished at once. If the whole world had mourned Delille, even Nature could be claimed to have darkened her colours for Grétry. Accordingly, Grétry's family chose to honour him on a grander scale than the simple marble headstone offered by the Institut. His nieces and nephews, whom Le Breton refers to as his adopted children⁶³, erected a square pedestal surmounted by a pediment, whose white marble contrasted with the black marble of the base. Situated over a vault, it was decorated with the symbol of Grétry's career and accomplishments, a gilded lyre. A portrait bust of Grétry was placed on top of the pedestal at a later date. (ill. 32)

⁶¹Joachim Le Breton, *Notice historique sur la vie et les ouvrages d'André-Ernest Grétry, Lue à la séance des Beaux arts de l'Institut royal de France le premier Octobre, 1814*, 1814, p.32

⁶²Étienne-Henri Méhul, *Institut Impérial de France, Funérailles de Grétry, 27 septembre, 1813*, Paris, p. 3

⁶³Le Breton, *Notice...Grétry*, 1814, p.34

Grétry's burial on the other side of the grove marked the emergence of a space dedicated to the musical profession in its various forms. In 1817, the composer Etienne-Henri Méhul, author of the *Chant du Départ*, joined Grétry. Over the years other figures included the composer and singer Pierre Gaveau (1761-1825), the composers Boïeldieu (1775-1834), Bellini (1802-1835), Lesueur (1760-1837) and Chérubini (1760-1842). The notion of a space of honour was so well entrenched that it continued over the next century, with the addition of the Italian tenor Tamberlinck in 1889 and the violinist Ginette Neveu in 1949.

In 1826, Delille's position at the end of the processional avenue in the grove was complemented at the other end by the celebrated actor Talma. (ill. 33) The erection of the actor's tomb added a seditious note to the peaceful grove, as Talma had actively embraced the principles of the Revolution, was an ardent Bonapartist and antagonistic to the Bourbon Restoration. Talma's funeral and monument were likewise expressions of opposition to the regime, as the actor had refused to receive the archbishop of Paris as he lay dying and insisted on a civil funeral.⁶⁴ Talma's popularity was demonstrated by the massive outpouring of mourners at his funeral, reported to be 80,000 in number. His coffin was carried by his young admirers through the streets and the public subscriptions launched in his honour were so successful that they resulted not only in a tomb designed by the architect Colson, but also the commission in marble of the plaster

⁶⁴*La Grande encyclopédie*, 31 vols., Paris, n.d., vol. 30, p. 896

model of David d'Angers' seated statue of Talma which had been exhibited at the 1827 Salon (ill. 34).⁶⁵

The rather sober architectonic tomb designed by Colson may have suited the reserved nature of the grove's other tombs, but originally, David d'Angers statue may have been intended to decorate the tomb rather than the galleries of the Théâtre-Français. A letter addressed to David from the Comédie Française in 1848 refers to the intention of moving the statue back to its originally intended location on the actor's tomb, as a worthy representation of Talma's talent.⁶⁶ David had represented Talma in classical drapery, seated and in an attitude of serious meditation. The pose and attitude recalled Talma's powerful talent as a dramatic actor, and the drapery referred to his role in the return of classical drapery to the theatre as opposed to the pastiche antique costumes of the period of Louis XIV. The transfer never took place and the statue went to the Tuileries gardens in 1852 until its return to the Comédie in 1862.⁶⁷

Despite not having been decorated with the work of an artist as prominent as David d'Angers, Talma's tomb at Père Lachaise was nonetheless of a very significant nature. The church had long banned actors and actresses from burial in consecrated ground. The most

⁶⁵*Paris and its Environs, Displayed in a Series of Picturesque Views from Original Drawings Taken Expressively for this Work, Comprising Views on the Seine, Churches, Palaces, Public Offices, Bridges, Aqueducts, Catacombs, Streets, Modern Improvements, etc.*, Drawings under the direction of A. Pugin, Esq., Engravings executed under the superintendence of Mr. C. Heath, Topographical and historical descriptions by L. T. Ventouillac (in French and English), London and Paris, vols. 1 and 2, 1829-1831, vol. 2, p. 149, Normand, aîné, *Monuments funéraires choisis dans les cimetières de Paris et des principales villes de France*, vols 1-2, Paris, 1847, vol. 2, plate 47 and *Biographie universelle (Michaud)*, ancienne et moderne, vols. 1-45, Paris, 1843-, vol. 40, p. 630

⁶⁶Comédie française, Secrétaire du comité de la restauration de la salle David d'Angers, 31 March, 1848. Ms. 1873, Bibliothèque municipale d'Angers.

⁶⁷Vivianne Huchard, *Galerie David d'Angers*, Angers, 1989, p. 65

famous case had been that of Molière in 1673, when the archbishop refused to allocate him a grave. Louis XIV ordered the burial to take place, and upon being informed that Molière's acting had made it impossible to do so on hallowed ground, the King asked 'Down to which depth is the ground hallowed?'. 'Four feet', replied the priest. 'Then bury him six feet down!' commanded the King.⁶⁸ The transfer of Molière's remains to the cemetery in 1817 and the establishment of such a prominent, public burial site for the acting profession was not to be underrated as the Church's prejudice against actors and actresses continued into the Nineteenth Century.

Talma's insistence on a civil burial was in part a reaction against this long-standing practice, whose continuation had been dramatically played out on 15 January, 1815 at the funeral of Mlle. Raucourt. Also known as Saucerotte, Mlle. Raucourt was one of the most famous tragic actresses of her day and Napoleon had put her in charge of the direction of the French theatre in Italy in 1806. While Mlle. Raucourt's burial at Père Lachaise posed no problems (ill. 35), at her funeral, the priest of the parish of Saint Roch, where she resided, refused her remains entry into the church which resulted in a great demonstration of affection for her by the crowds, as they knocked down the doors of the church. Louis XVIII was forced to intervene and send in representatives to re-instate order.⁶⁹ The riot at Mlle's Raucourt's funeral was however also a very political demonstration of discontent with the Bourbon Restoration regime, which was inextricably associated

⁶⁸Alexandre Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français, ou Description historique et chronologique des statues en marbre et en bronze, bas-reliefs et tombeaux des hommes et des femmes célèbres, pour servir à l'histoire de France et celle de l'Art*, vols. 1-8, Paris, 1800-1821, vol. 5, p. 197

⁶⁹G. Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, Saint-Amand, 1955, p. 87

and allied with the Church. Talma's civil burial, the popular support demonstrated by the success of the public subscription organized for his commemoration and the prominent position at the end of the grove, opposite the illustrious Delille, extended far beyond the glorification of the actor as a member of this group of eighteenth-century luminaries. The prestigious nature of Talma's commemoration was a tacit critique of the regime, of the political system, which fostered the Church's prejudice against the acting profession. By the time Talma was joined by the dramatic actress Marie H  l  ne Bourgoin in the grove in 1833 (ill. 36), the Bourbon Restoration had been overthrown, but the prestigious representation of the acting profession in the grove was a potent reminder of their exclusion from traditional commemoration. Talma's case highlights two important factors that distinguished the nature of commemoration at P  re Lachaise. In the first place, in light of the acting profession's history of exclusion, P  re Lachaise emerged as a space where ostracized groups could be commemorated without interference. In the second place, the source of Talma's commemoration, a public subscription, illustrates that P  re Lachaise was a space open to the display of unofficial public statements.

Official participation in the commemorative process was in fact extremely limited at P  re Lachaise. For both Delille and Brongniart the city of Paris had paid homage by donating their respective plots, but in Brongniart's case it would seem that this was less than a spontaneous gesture, offered only several months after the architect died, and probably only at the family's request.⁷⁰ Public recognition by the

⁷⁰For Delille, see Paul-Albert, *Histoire du P  re Lachaise*, Paris, 1937, p. 224. A report to the Minister of the Interior expresses Brongniart's family's wish: 'Elle [the family] attache un grand prix    cette faveur, qu'elle regarderait comme un

government of the illustrious was as of yet unformulated in the new Elysium, or had not yet found a figure great enough to celebrate. What became formulated instead in the space was an elevation to *grand homme* status by one's peers, family and friends, thanks to the position and scale of the tombs chosen and by the general public by their participation in subscriptions, such as that for the Delille and Talma monuments, and through their subsequent visits.

It is clear that status at Père Lachaise rested on an entirely different set of criteria from that of the officially recognized *grand homme* and the elevated status of figures like Talma, who did not conform to institutional criteria of official commemoration, either in the Church or Pantheon, highlights the different nature and characteristics of the illustrious figures celebrated and singled out at Père Lachaise. In other cases, the cemetery allowed for the celebration of figures who might otherwise have been deemed too mediocre, not only in retrospect, but even in their own time. For example, the talents of Grétry as a composer of comic opera had been surpassed even in his day by many others such as Gossec, Le Sueur, Cherubini and Méhul.⁷¹ Public service for example was still an important factor in achieving status, as in the case of Delille, who in the eulogies delivered at his funeral, was lauded as much for his 'scintillating service to public education', as for his poetry, or Brongniart who had been in public

témoignage honorable d'estime publique et comme une reconnaissance des soins...que feu M. Brongniart s'est donné pour l'établissement et l'embellissement de ce cimetière.' See *Rapport présenté au Ministre de l'Intérieur. Proposition d'autoriser M. le Préfet à concéder gratuitement à la famille du feu M. Brongniart le terrain dans lequel cet architecte a été inhumé dans le cimetière de l'Est. Paris, le 27 Novembre 1813*. A. N. F² (I) 123

⁷¹At least this is the opinion of the *Biographie universelle*, Paris, vol. 17, 1857, p.506

office as the Chief Inspector General of a section of Public Works for the Department of the Seine.⁷²

The emergence of a second grove in the cemetery (see Map 1) also illustrated the difference in the criteria for fame in the cemetery as opposed to that of the traditional *grand homme*. The fame of the second grove centred on the figure of a dragoon named Antoine Guillaume Lagrange, who had died on the battlefield of Eylau February 4, 1807 and the site quickly became known as the *bosquet du dragon*, but Lagrange's only claim to glory was that he had volunteered to lead the way at a difficult point of passage and was killed as a result. The monument had been erected by his mother and designed by the architect Étienne Hippoloyte Godde (1781-1869), who had since taken over Brongniart's position at Père Lachaise. (ill. 37) In the shape of a simple rounded headstone, it is lavishly decorated with a medallion, and surrounded by a laurel and oak wreath, containing the portrait in uniform of the Dragoon Lagrange. Below, on either side of the inscription are, in bas-relief, the dragoon's inverted carbine and sabre, a traditional symbol used to signify the death of a soldier. At the bottom is the figure of a female mourner, a *douloureuse* or *pleureuse* resting on a funerary urn, which was more than just a traditional allegorical device, in that it illustrated the dual function of the monument as a testament to the bravery of the dragoon and to the tenderness of motherly love. As the epitaph reads: 'Homage of a tender mother in memory of the best and

⁷²Delambre, *Discours prononcé aux obsèques de Delille*, in Arnaud, *Receuil*, vol.1, 1817, p. 6

the most unfortunate of sons, Antoine C. M. Guillaume Lagrange, only child, aged 25 and six months...who died a hero on the battlefield...'73

The monument was in fact a cenotaph, an unoccupied tomb, which was uncommon at Père Lachaise. Marchant de Beaumont claimed the dragoon's was one of only two in the cemetery in 1822.⁷⁴ The erection of these cenotaphs points to the function of Père Lachaise as more than just a place of burial, but a space of public commemoration as well. As Marchant de Beaumont pointed out, the cenotaph afforded Mme. Lagrange the possibility of rendering public homage to the memory of her son.⁷⁵ A relatively undistinguished dragoon could be brought to the public's attention and immortalized on a par almost with great military heroes. But it was not great military feats that ensured that the tomb of the dragoon became one of the most popular and well known monuments of the cemetery. Rather, in the years during which the military victories of the Empire were becoming increasingly infrequent, the romantic combination of youth, tragic death and maternal affection, ensured the fame of the monument. As one guidebook pointed out, those who searched out the tomb did not do so out of a sense of history or military pride, instead the tomb attracted the gaze of the 'sensitive man, the honest and good man, who in the midst of these tombs, seeks those sweet emotions that console, that remind him of some of those precious virtues...'76 In opposition to the immortalization of glory and achievement elaborated

⁷³'Hommage d'une tendre mère à la mémoire du meilleur et du plus malheureux des fils, Antoine C. M. Lagrange, fils unique, âgé de 25 ans et six mois...mort en héros sur le champs de bataille...'

⁷⁴Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques*, Paris, 1822, p. 337

⁷⁵Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques*, Paris, 1822, p. 337

⁷⁶Arnaud, *Receuil*, Paris, vol. 1, 1817, p. 34

in Delille's grove, the dragoon's grove became a space illustrating private, domestic virtue, with the establishment of a number of prominent bourgeois family vaults and mausoleums over the course of the following years, a topic dealt with in the last chapter of this work.

In opposition to the *ronds-points*, intended for the commemoration of officially recognized illustrious figures, fame in the groves and throughout the rest of the cemetery, was based on very different criteria such as sentiment, popular appeal and notoriety rather than great achievements, heroic deeds or great public service. In 1817, when the Museum of French Monuments was dismantled and the monuments of Abélard and Héloïse, Molière and La Fontaine, were moved to Père Lachaise, the *Moniteur Universel* noted that they would be joining other illustrious figures there, such as Delille, Chénier, Laujon, Madame Cottin, Grétry, Fourcroy, Parmentier, Mentelle, Madame Barilli and Mademoiselle Raucourt.⁷⁷ The list would certainly vary according to the individual or institution composing it, but it is nonetheless useful to illustrate how the status of the *grand homme* was articulated and defined at Père Lachaise. For example, despite the fact that the *Moniteur* had been the official mouthpiece of the government throughout successive regimes, it had nonetheless selected figures that had at one time or another been perceived as embracing political beliefs antagonistic to those of the current Bourbon Restoration regime.

Though Delille and Grétry's popularity had been well demonstrated at the time of their deaths in 1813, they would not necessarily be acceptable in 1817. Delille had allegedly had a brief dalliance with the revolutionary government and supposedly wrote the

⁷⁷*Moniteur Universel*, No. 61, 2 March, 1817

hymn for the festival of the Supreme Being held in September of 1794, but such a small lapse could easily be glossed over. Some biographical sources claim he refused to write the hymn, and was forced into exile as a result, where he remained until 1801.⁷⁸ Others claim he did write the hymn, but only out of a deep reverence for the notions of the existence of God and immortality reinstated by the festival.⁷⁹ While excuses could be made for Delille, Grétry's acceptability is not so easily explained.

The musician was well known to have republican sympathies. His operas included *Fête de la Raisons*, *Rosière républicaine* (1793) and *Denys, le Tyrant* (1794). Comic operas included *Joseph Bara* and *Callias* or *Amour et Patrie*. Grétry's *Memoirs or Essais sur la on Musique* (1789), and *De la vérité, ce que nous fûmes, ce que nous sommes, ce que nous devons être* (1801), were more concerned with touting the republican line, about liberty and equality than with music. In fact after Napoleon's coup of the 18 brumaire (Nov, 1799), Grétry's ideas were out of favour, and he only managed to safeguard his last publication by including a simpering preface glorifying Napoleon as the hero of the moment. Perhaps it was Grétry's success with the monarchy before 1789 that safeguarded his reputation after 1815, but more likely it was his incredible popularity with the public at large that maintained him as a figure of note even in 1817.

The most controversial figure by far was Marie-Joseph Chénier, who had wholeheartedly espoused the revolutionary machine after 1789, as a deputy to the national Convention, of the *Conseil des 500*

⁷⁸*Biographie universelle*, Vol. 10, 1852, p. 330

⁷⁹Tissot, *Oeuvres de Delille*, vol. 1, 1832, p. XX

and the Tribunat. (ill. 38) Author of the words to the *Chant du départ*, he was also an essential organizer along with David and Gossec of a number of revolutionary festivals. Above all, Chénier had voted for the death of Louis XVI. After 1794 political life had become quite dangerous for Chénier. He was jailed, and while his brother André perished as a victim of the Terror, Chénier barely escaped with his life and could therefore be construed as a victim of the revolution. But even these unforeseen turn of events could hardly erase the fact that Chénier had voted for the death of Louis XVI. Or could they?

At the time of his death in January of 1811, the events of the revolution had not been completely rejected, but the notion of regicide was certainly politically incorrect, and Chénier's reputation already needed repairing. At Chénier's funeral, Arnault blamed his youth for having allowed him to be swept up in revolutionary events. His ardent nature could not help but get involved, and he had been torn, it would seem, against his will and better judgment, from his literary work.⁸⁰ However, there were those who could not forget so easily. When Châteaubriand took Chénier's place at the Institut, he was obliged, as was the custom, to read an eulogy to his predecessor. Châteaubriand read a draft to a preliminary committee, but it was not at all elegiac. It was referred to the Emperor himself, who was so outraged by the extravagant recriminations it contained, that he banned Châteaubriand's election and Châteaubriand only officially become a member of the Institut with the return of the Bourbons.

⁸⁰Arnault, *Institut de France, Funérailles de M. de Chénier, le 12, janvier, 1811*, n.d., pp. 2-3

Châteaubriand's rehabilitation was not however accompanied by any official degradation of the man he had slandered.

In 1817 a strong liberal element in government was working hard to defend and rehabilitate the events of the Revolution and even the act of regicide.⁸¹ The Charter of 1814 had guaranteed no punishment for past votes and opinions, but it was the *de facto* penalties that the liberals had to fight. In order to do so, liberal propaganda transformed the execution of Louis XVI into an incident of a Revolution propelled by an entire nation. Singling out individuals such as Chénier who had actually voted for a verdict of guilty was therefore pointless. As Lazare Carnot wrote to Louis XVIII, in defense of his own activities during that period:

'If they fell into error, they are in the same circumstances as any other judges who have erred. They have erred together with the entire nation which provoked that judgment, urged as they were, by thousands of appeals sent in from the departments...They have erred in common with all the nations in Europe who dealt with them.'⁸²

Despite this strategy of defense, Chénier's literary achievements were hardly of such high calibre anyway to promote him to the traditional status of *grand homme*. This lack of *grand homme* qualities was visible as well in the rest of the *Moniteur*'s list as well: Laujon, Madame Cottin, Fourcroy, Parmentier, Mentelle, Madame Barilli and Mademoiselle Raucourt, now generally obscure individuals. Pierre

⁸¹See Stanley Mellon, *The Political Uses of History, A Study of Historians in the French Restoration*, Stanford and London, 1985, p. 39

⁸²Quoted in Guizot, *Du gouvernement de la France depuis la Restauration et du ministère actuel*, Second Edition, 1802, pp. 1-2. Reprinted in Mellon, *The Political Uses of History*, Stanford and London, 1985, p. 39

Laujon died July 14, 1811. He dabbled in writing poetry, song, theatre and opera among other things and was a member of the Institut. His fortune was destroyed by the Revolution which could make him a heroic candidate, but there were many others in the same position. Edme Mentelle died on 28 December 1815. He had been a geographer and professor who dabbled in literature. His achievements as an educator and writer of geographical textbooks are as close as he seems to have come to great public service. Antoine François de Fourcroy's name (died 1809) has a longer list of merits associated with it, as a chemist, a writer of treatises on medicine and chemistry and also as a politician. (ill. 39) He was a *député suppléant* of the National Convention, a member of the *Conseil des Anciens* until 1798 when he became a member of the *Conseil d'état* concerned with matters of public instruction. It is perhaps this last position that safeguarded his reputation. Thanks to him three schools of medicine were opened, in Paris, Montpellier and Strasbourg respectively; twelve law schools and about thirty *lycées*. The actual political regime under which these accomplishments occurred seem hardly important in light of the benefit to society they provided and the utility of Fourcroy's works far outweighed the pitfalls of his political affiliations. Indeed politics had been whitewashed in order to let the glory of his educational achievements shine. In 1811, when Cuvier read the eulogy to Fourcroy, who had died 16 December 1809, he referred to enemies who had brought the language of his political speeches against him, but Cuvier managed to play down Fourcroy's politics with the excuse that the times necessitated all propositions to be coated in republican idiom in order to be heard. Cuvier basically attributed Fourcroy's republican

discourse as a means adopted purely to instigate the acceptance of his educational reforms.⁸³

The chemist Parmentier's claim to greatness may also seem a bit spurious at first. As far as the French public was concerned, Parmentier's greatest claim to fame is having brought the potato to light and revealing its excellent and economic nutritive qualities in the 1770's. In doing so he came to the aid of the needy masses, who could find in this plant a cheap but filling nutrient. When wheat crops failed, the ensuing famine could thus be allayed by the use of Parmentier's potato. When Parmentier died in 1813, his fellow pharmacists, students and colleagues certainly felt he was deserving of a great monument to commemorate that achievement and they gathered together to erect a monumental tomb decorated with bas-reliefs on two sides depicting some of the agricultural products Parmentier had worked on. In one scene, a hoe is framed by stalks of wheat and corn on either side. (ill. 40) A second bas-relief depicts a grape vine, some chemical instruments and most importantly, a basket full of potatoes. (ill. 41) The great value of Parmentier's discoveries, although perhaps risible at first, are still recognized today as potato plants are still cultivated, as a fitting homage, all around his tomb.

The list is hardly replete with clear images of genius and the traditional image of what one might consider a *grand homme*. The *grand homme*, in the past, a figure of exceptional qualities and achievements, whether in art, science or public service, stood apart

⁸³Elegy of Fourcroy read at a public session of the Royal Institute of France on January 7, 1811. See Cuvier, *Éloges Historiques*, Paris, 1860, p. 129. Previously published in Cuvier, *Recueil des éloges historiques lus dans les séances publiques de l'Institut Royal de France de 1811 à 1818*, Paris, 1819

from the rest. At Père Lachaise these distinctions were being challenged and eroded as figures of popular appeal, notoriety and momentary fame were being raised to the ranks of the illustrious, on a par with some of the greatest figures of French History such as Molière for example. This challenge to the traditional definition of the so-called *grand homme* meant that not only could certain groups and individuals who did not necessarily merit the distinction could now be considered within that category, but also that groups and individuals formerly institutionally denied access to such a title could share in the glory at Père Lachaise to a certain degree. As Arnaud's title page in his *Receuil des tombeaux* stated, it was a volume 'decorated with forty carefully executed line engraved plates, among which are the tombs of several illustrious men and famous women...'⁸⁴ While Arnaud maintained a distinction between the status of notable women and men, between the illustrious and the famous, women were nonetheless finally able to achieve a certain amount of public recognition at Père Lachaise, something they had been denied in the traditional, official forms and spaces of commemoration.

Mme. Cottin, Mme. Barilli and the actress Mlle. Raucourt may have achieved notability largely because they represented anomalies. They were figures of women who had not conformed to the norm, but given that their male counterparts were claiming illustrious, quasi-*grand homme* status on the basis of very small achievements and merits, this was not necessarily something to be viewed negatively. Madame Barilli (1780-October 24, 1813), née Bondini, was the *première cantatrice* at the Italian Opera in Paris and her fame was

⁸⁴Title page, Arnaud, *Receuil*, Paris, vol. 1, 1817

widespread, if we are to judge by the immense number of mourners at her funeral.⁸⁵ (ill. 42) In her time, however, regardless of the elevated venue of the opera, a woman with a stage career would never be wholly without blame in the eyes of her contemporaries. The public character of such a career, indeed any career, was deemed wholly unsuitable for any proper woman to engage in.

Madame Cottin's tomb is a simple stone slab, devoid of decoration, but her authorship of a number of extremely popular but proper romantic novels made her a notable figure and while her claim to fame may not seem at first glance problematic, nonetheless she had her fair share of problems. Mme. Cottin died in 1807 and her novels were still so immensely popular in 1817 when the first publication of her complete works appeared that a second edition came out only a year later.⁸⁶ In retrospect her books do not seem to qualify as great literature, but then neither does much of the work of her so-called illustrious male companions at Père Lachaise. It seems that while the mediocre accomplishments of these men could be dressed up as illustriousness, it was purely a question of gender that prevented Mme. Cottin from achieving that rank. Before even considering her work, Alexandre Petitot, the editor of Mme. Cottin's complete works, pondered the ongoing debate over whether it was 'proper for a woman to deliver herself to the judgment of the public by having her works

⁸⁵See *Biographie universelle*, vol. 3, Paris, 1843, p. 99

⁸⁶*Oeuvres complètes de Madame Cottin, publiées pour la première fois en un seul corps d'ouvrage avec une notice sur la vie et les écrits de l'auteur*, Alexandre Petitot, ed., 5 vols., Paris, 1817 and *Oeuvres complètes de Mme. Cottin, avec une notice sur la vie et les écrits de Mme. Cottin, suivie de considérations sur quelques femmes auteurs*, Alexandre Petitot, ed., 12 vols., Paris, 1818

printed?'⁸⁷ In the second edition of her complete works, Petitot elaborated on the debate by compiling a list of famous opinions on the subject of why women were incapable of true literature from the likes of J. J. Rousseau, who claimed that 'women in general...do not like any art, do not appreciate any, and have no genius'⁸⁸, to Labruyère who claimed that 'a *femme savante*.' is regarded 'like a beautiful weapon; it is beautifully finished, admirably polished...it is a curio piece that one shows off to the curious, but is not useful'⁸⁹. Petitot concurred: 'Men of letters have over women authors, (note the distinction) a given superiority that it is assuredly impossible to overlook and contest: all the works of women put together are not worth a few pages from Bossuet, Pascal, a few scenes from Corneille, Racine or Molière.'⁹⁰ One begins to wonder why Petitot even deigned to write this introduction, and why Mme Cottin or any other woman appeared on the *Moniteur's* list? However, if notoriety and fame were what defined the illustrious male at Père Lachaise, the same could be applied to women. Mme. Cottin's novels were popular and sold well and moreover, in comparison with a number of other women writers, Cottin emerged as

⁸⁷'...avant d'examiner les productions littéraires de madame Cottin, les idées se portent naturellement sur cette question si souvent débattue: est-il convenable qu'une femme se livre au jugement du public en faisant imprimer ses ouvrages?' *Oeuvres complètes de Mme. Cottin*, Alexandre Petitot, ed., Paris, 1817, vol. 1, p.VI

⁸⁸'Les femmes en général...n'aiment aucun art, ne se connaissent à aucun, et n'ont aucun génie.' *Oeuvres complètes de Mme. Cottin*, Alexandre Petitot, ed., Paris, 1818, vol.1, p. XI

⁸⁹'On regarde une femme savante comme on fait une belle arme; elle est ciselée artistement, d'une polissure admirable et d'un travail fort recherché: c'est une pièce de cabinet que l'on montre aux curieux, qui n'est pas d'usage...' *Oeuvres complètes de Mme. Cottin*, Alexandre Petitot, ed., Paris, 1818, vol.1, p. XV

⁹⁰'Les hommes de lettres ont, sur les femme auteurs, une supériorité de fait qu'il est assurément impossible de méconnaître et de contester: tous les ouvrages de femmes rassemblés ne valent pas quelques belles pages de Bossuet, de Pascal, quelques scènes de Corneille, de Racine, de Molière etc.' *Oeuvres complètes de Mme. Cottin*, Alexandre Petitot, ed., Paris, 1818, vol. 1, p. XVI

a more acceptable type. In summation, Petitot mentioned a series of other women, such as Mme Sévigné, who he claimed wrote for the nursery. Cottin's works were perceived as more elevated than this, and more worthy of serious regard, but asserted Petitot, she did not make the mistake of taking herself too seriously or pretend to an elevated intelligence, as Mme de Stael had, rising above her station and giving herself a tone of importance and pomp totally unacceptable for a woman.⁹¹

Several things can be gleaned from this account of the notable inhabitants of Père Lachaise from 1804-1817. The notion of Elysium had been greatly extended, from one of officially recognized figures to one of self-formulated, self-defined groups of acclaimed figures, illustrated by the groupings in Delille's grove. As a result, the very notion of Elysium, and public homage had become ambiguous and complex. While greatness had long been defined by location, such as commemoration in the Pantheon, or as in the past, in a particular chapel of the Church, and had been provided for by the establishment of *ronds-points* at Père Lachaise, the development of cumulative, self-appointed locations of fame, such as the grove, for particular groups was indeed a new phenomenon and a new freedom. The Institut, Brongniart and his circle, had appropriated the grove as a special space of commemoration, within which proximity and groupings generated further levels of meaning.

The absence of sculpture, of the hand of a recognized and celebrated artist, or even of an interesting architectural design, in

⁹¹ *Oeuvres complètes de Mme. Cottin*, Alexandre Petitot, ed., Paris, 1818, vol. 1, pp.LXXXI-CXII

many of these monuments has often led them to be ignored as devoid of any deeper significance. Recent art historical analysis has primarily insisted on recovering neglected works of art in the cemetery by recognized artists and as a result, in most cases the individual to whom the tomb is actually dedicated seems of secondary importance. This approach has tended to obscure the notion that for many of these tombs it is precisely from their location and their surrounding that meaning must be gleaned. For the elegiac poets and writers, the promoters of the picturesque, the grove in itself was of great significance. Proximity and numbers created solidarity, in the face of prejudice, for example, for the actors. Similarly, the formation of a musical Valhalla made it possible for the less talented or renowned to be remembered by proximity to the more famous. This concept of the creation of demarcated spaces within the cemetery as ascribed with particular meaning would soon spread to other areas of the cemetery, far beyond what Brongniart may have initially had in mind when he laid out his groves, particularly in the development of a space dominated by bourgeois family commemoration in the dragoon's grove and of a military enclave directly to the north of the grove.

Even the notion of what constituted greatness had been transformed in the new Elysium as notoriety, sentiment, and public appeal seemed to override the concept of truly great achievements, heroic deeds or great public service. As a result groups that had been traditionally denied access to great honours or indeed any form of traditional commemoration, such as actors, political undesirables and women, were able to carve out their own niches of fame and attention. The celebrated figures of Père Lachaise were not necessarily of the

calibre that Frochot and Quatremère de Quincy had in mind when they had thought of enlisting illustrious figures to attract potential buyers to their projected peristyle, but nonetheless, while the peristyle was never built, these celebrities may indeed have attracted both visitors and investors to the cemetery, thus contributing to its phenomenal success. The celebrity status of many of the figures in the cemetery helped to redefine its attraction as an exclusive burial site as proximity with famous figures became a way of defining one's own status. In the same manner in which institutional groups such as the Institut, or professional groups such as actors, found at Père Lachaise a space that enabled them to publicly define their identities, the erection of private monuments and mausoleums also offered the rest of the population a means to define their own social, economic and political status. The rising popularity of Père Lachaise around 1815 can probably be seen as the result of a combination of many of these factors, such as the Institut's decision in 1810 to commemorate their members in a grandiose fashion at Père Lachaise, the emergence of sites of glory like the grove, the cumulative appearance of celebrities, the publicity afforded by an ever increasing number of guidebooks and the transfers from the Museum of French Monuments in 1817, transforming the cemetery into a very desirable place of burial for the middle and upper classes. Ironically, it became so desirable, that the indigent and poor who had originally stigmatized the space were eventually pushed out in favour of exclusive use by the wealthy.

Chapter Three

Reappropriating Commemorative Practices: The Bourbon Restoration and the Apotheosis of Louis XVI

The transfer of celebrities such as Molière, La Fontaine, Héloïse and Abélard after 1817 may indeed have been partially responsible for what appeared to be a marked increase in popularity for the cemetery, in terms both of the sheer number of tombs and of widespread public interest. The transfers however were part of a larger political strategy on the part of the Restoration involving the re-appropriation of Ancien Regime forms and sites of commemoration. Within this context the enhancement of the cemetery's image and its rise in popularity during this period was likewise involved in this discourse, as a response to the commemorative ideology of the Bourbon Restoration regime and as a result of the new political significance burial in the cemetery had acquired.

The Restoration's reorganization of commemorative processes and imagery was one of the Regime's most immediate concerns. The Desaix Fountain, incorporating a small portrait bust being crowned by an allegorical warrior of France, designed by Charles Percier (1764-1838) and inaugurated in 1802 on what was then called the Place Thionville (and later became the Place Dauphine) had been, along with the more ambitious autonomous Desaix monument designed by Claude Dejoux (for the Place des Victoires, unveiled in 1810, the first incursions into the capital's public spaces by a non-royal figure). (ills. 43 and 44) The Place des Victoires monument had to be screened off and was already threatened with removal during the Empire, supposedly on the grounds

of the embarrassment caused by its nudity. Its subsequent removal by the Restoration government was however based on ideological grounds, involving the reinstatement of royal monuments to urban squares. The ideological importance of that exchange was further emphasized by the melting down not only of the statue of Napoleon from the Colonne Vendôme, but also of the Desaix monument, for use in casting an equestrian statue of Henri IV for the Pont Neuf.¹ The Restoration regime's ideology of commemoration in the capital included therefore not only the transposition of the figures of rulers in the public arena, but also of any autonomous commemorative monument to an individual of merit in exchange for the monopolization of these spaces by royal figures. If the Desaix fountain in the Place Dauphine survived the change of regime, it was probably due in part to its utilitarian function. It was after all equally a reflection of the Napoleonic campaign to supply the capital with adequate access to water, elaborated in the decree of 2 May, 1806 which ordered the restoration of old fountains and the erection of at least fifteen new ones.² Moreover, the Desaix fountain was not established as the physical or symbolic focus of a square, thus usurping the site of a former royal monument, but rather, as contemporary illustrations show, located off to the side of the square.³

¹For history of the monuments see June Hargrove, *Les Statues de Paris, La Représentation des Grands Hommes dans les rues et sur les places de Paris*, Anvers et Paris, 1989, pp. 45-53

²For decree see Katia Frey, 'L'Entreprise napoléonienne', *Paris et ses fontaines, de la Renaissance à nos jours*, Paris, 1995, pp. 104-105

³The fountain remained in its original position until 1875, when the square was enlarged. Katia Frey, 'L'Entreprise napoléonienne', *Paris et ses fontaines*, Béatrice de Andia, ed., Paris, 1995, p. 109

Churches such as the Pantheon, were also not only restored to their religious function, but also reorganized in many case as spaces of official Bourbon commemoration, dedicated to members of the royal family as in the case of Saint Denis and the projected Church of the Madeleine. These practices culminated in plans for a number of expiatory monuments dedicated to Louis XVI, at Saint Denis, the Madeleine, the Place de la Concorde and the complex established on the site of the former cemetery where he had been buried, known as the *Chapelle Expiatoire*. The mechanism behind their conception, placement and iconography can be perceived not only as embodying the general principles that engendered the transformation of the cemetery into a politically oppositional space, but probably as one of the most significant aspects of that transformation.

The dismantling of the Museum of French Monuments was part of this re-appropriation of spaces of commemoration. In the spirit of returning France to the state the monarchy had left her in, all the monuments amassed at the museum would be returned as far as it was feasible to their original location.⁴ The *Moniteur*'s explanation of the decision to disperse the monuments indicated that it was perceived as a means of strengthening the veneration of the people for the memory of their princes, for religion and public morality.⁵ The re-establishment of the royal sepulchre at Saint Denis and of the royal tombs was perceived as a necessary step to achieving this. The distribution of other great figures from the Museum, like the relics of saints, to the various churches of Paris and to the galleries of the Royal Museum was likewise

⁴*Moniteur Universel*, No. 61, 2 March, 1817

⁵*Moniteur Universel*, No. 280, 7 October, 1817

implicated in this process.⁶ Specific choices were made about which 'celebrities' from the museum of French Monuments belonged at the Père Lachaise and which ones belonged within the sanctity of church walls and these choices articulated and constructed a particular conception of the cemetery and the meaning of burial within its precincts.

On February 26, 1819, the remains of Descartes, Montfaucon and Mabillon were transferred to the Church of Saint Germain-des-Près. The three philosophers had all belonged to the Benedictine order and had originally been buried in a chapel - since destroyed - at Saint-Germain-des-Près and their return was perceived as restoring to the 'the protection of religion the ashes of these great men whose wise writings have honoured France.'⁷ As free-standing monuments, the monumentality of Lenoir's monuments may have made them impractical for the confines of the church and they were discarded. Moreover, the significance of their size and iconography was also contrary to the very notion of burial within the church. In Lenoir's garden, visitors had made pilgrimages to view the relics of genius and fame in the same manner as pilgrims had once come to view the relics of saints, however, Descartes, Mabillon and Montfaucon were not saints

⁶On dit que Saint Eustache va recevoir les mausolées de Colbert et Chevet...Roi de Pologne, Casimir et la famille Castellane à Saint Germain-des-Près, Cardinal Gondi, maréchaux Gondi et d'Harcourt, Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet, Jérôme Bignon, avocat général, et Charles Lebrun à Notre Dame, curé Languet de Gergy à Saint Sulpice, Connétable Anne de Montmorency, sa statue et celle de sa femme à l'église de Montmorency.' *Moniteur Universel*, No. 87, 28 March, 1817. For transfers to Royal Museum see *Moniteur Universel*, No 86, 27 March, 1817.

⁷'...la cérémonie...va replacer, sous la sauvegarde de la religion les cendres des grands-homme dont les doctes travaux et le génie ont honoré la France.' Sylvestre de Sacy, Président de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres, *Procès verbal de la remise à MM. les Commissaires de M. le Préfet de la Seine, des restes de Descartes, Mabillon et Montfaucon, qui étaient déposés dans le jardin des Petits-Augustins à Paris*, Paris, 1819, pp. 2-3

and it was not appropriate that their position within the church be the focus of the building. At Saint- Germain they were to be commemorated together by a single simplified monument, with three compartments in the floor, surmounted by a monument made up of columns supporting marble slabs with their names engraved in gold letters.⁸ A triple arcade of rounded black marble plaques is still visible today, discretely tucked away in the wall of Saint Benedict's chapel, off the north aisle. On 14 July, 1819, the remains of Boileau-Despréaux also made the trip to Saint Germain, for, the *Moniteur* declared, he:

'had wanted to be laid down in the shadow of the altar; religion lays claim to him, and, no doubt, she has a right to the mortal remains of one who always displayed such a profound and sincere respect for her.'⁹

At the museum, veneration of these figures had been governed by the republican cult of merit, and their return within the confines of the Church, both physically and spiritually was an important step in dismantling the revolutionary system of beliefs. The political nature of the transfer was indicated by the attendance of not only church members but of government officials and the presidents of several Academies of the Institut de France as well. They were also well publicized, with transcripts of the speeches published in the official newspaper, the *Moniteur Universel*. The secular rhetoric of emulation

⁸*Moniteur Universel*, No. 16, 16 January, 1819

⁹'...nous ne devons point oublier que celui à qui appartenait cette poussière, avait voulu être déposé à l'ombre des autels, la religion le reclame, et sans doute elle a ses droits sur les dépouilles mortelles de celui qui se montra toujours pénétré d'un respect si sincère pour elle'. M. le Comte Daru, President of the Académie française, *Discours prononcé à l'occasion de la translation des cendres de Boileau-Despréaux en l'Eglise paroissiale de Saint Germain-des-Près, par MM. les Présidents des deux Académies dont cet auteur fut membre*. Mercredi 14 Juillet, 1819, Extract from the *Moniteur Universel*, Paris, 1819 p. 2

developed during the Eighteenth Century was still at play, but was now used to ally genius in literature, poetry and science with the Church, knowledge and greatness with faith. Descartes was an especially useful example as he embodied both the virtues of reason, so highly prized by the Enlightenment and often raised as a contrast to religion, and the virtues of faith as well. As Sylvestre de Sacy pointed out, by

'honouring the memory of two men [Descartes and Mabillon] as dear to religion as to literature, in depositing their venerable remains in this sacred space to which they formerly belonged, not less by their piety than by their useful and learned works...', it was conceivable that

'...our nephews may know, like him, how to combine submission to faith with the elevated speculations of science and philosophy, and reconcile human reason with the sacrifices that are imposed by religion.'¹⁰

Within this context it becomes clear that the transfer of Molière, La Fontaine, Abélard and Héloïse from the Museum to Père Lachaise was not simply part of an advertising campaign, but a very politicized exclusion from the spaces of official commemoration and glorification to which the other monuments had been granted admission. It is true that the original resting places of these four were no longer available, but they also did not represent the right kind of propaganda material for

¹⁰'Mais en honorant la mémoire de deux hommes aussi chers à la religion qu'aux lettres, en déposant leurs restes vénérables dans le lieu saint auxquels ils appartenrent autrefois, non moins par leur piété que par leur savans et utiles travaux...il leurs sera permis de souhaiter, et peut être d'espérer, qu'instruits par l'expérience du passé, nos neveux sauront, comme lui, joindre la soumission de la foi aux hautes spéculations des sciences et de la philosophie, et reconcilier la raison humaine avec les sacrifices que lui impose la religion.' Sylvestre de Sacy, *Procès verbal de la remise à MM. les Commissaires de M. le Préfet de la Seine, des restes de Descartes, Mabillon et Montfaucon*, Paris, 1819, pp. 3-4

Church and monarchy. As discussed in the previous chapter, Molière, as an actor was denied burial in consecrated ground, a practice which was perpetuated in 1815 by the priest from the parish of Saint Roch who refused to allow the remains of the actress Mlle. Raucourt into the church. Despite Héloïse and Abélard's religious careers, neither was the embarrassing reality of the seduction of a young girl by a religious figure such as Abélard and the notion of two unmarried lovers, an abbess and a priest, buried side by side in a Church, ideal propaganda material for promoting the Church and Monarchy.¹¹

Transfers to Père Lachaise seem to have been restricted to figures that did not fit neatly into the ideological focus of official retrieval and commemoration. Moreover, Père Lachaise was in itself formulated as a space and an institution underpinned by an ideology of democratic, secular commemoration that was fundamentally irreconcilable with the system the Restoration was trying to reinstate. While forced to accept the existence of the new institution, the Restoration's policy certainly did not embrace it for its own purposes. The concept of a space where ability, achievement, bourgeois wealth and popular appeal could overshadow rank and birth was the very opposite of the model of hierarchy and royal lineage the Restoration regime was trying to re-

¹¹However, on government orders, a service was celebrated for them at the church of Saint Germain-des-Près on June 16, 1817, *Moniteur Universel*, No. 171, 20 June, 1817. Their remains were transported after the ceremony, chastely in separate coffins, to Père Lachaise, awaiting the reconstruction of their monument from the Museum of French Monuments. *Moniteur Universel*, No. 173, 22 June, 1817

The reconstruction was finished by November 6, 1819, and announced in the *Moniteur*. The return of the remains of Abélard and Héloïse in their separate compartments to the monument was still pending. A medal with the portraits of the lovers, that had formerly adorned the house of the chanoine Fulbert in Paris, uncle of Héloïse, was added to the principal facade of the tomb. *Moniteur Universel*, No. 311, 7 November, 1817

establish at Saint Denis. While protected from prosecution by a general amnesty, the presence and honour awarded to individuals, such as M.-J. Chénier, who had voted for the death of Louis XVI was anti-antithetical to the widespread plans for the expiatory commemoration of the martyred monarch planned in the capital.

This attitude was illustrated by the transfer, in great pomp and splendour of the remains of Louise de Lorraine, wife of Henri III, from the cemetery to Saint Denis. This was not a return to her original resting place, as she had originally been interred at the convent of the Capuchins Saint Honoré in 1606 and transferred in 1688 to the convent of the Capuchins at the place Vendôme. Her remains had been retrieved in 1806 and on Napoleon's orders, transported to Père Lachaise.¹² While Louis XVIII was in the midst of recovering royal remains from the undignified places of rest the Revolution had thrown them in, Antoine Caillot, author of a *Voyage religieux et sentimental aux quatre cimetières de Paris*, wrote a letter to the Minister of the Interior pointing out that Louise de Lorraine lay in a neglected tomb in Père Lachaise cemetery.¹³ This letter is dated March 9, 1815, but Louise de Lorraine would not be returned to Saint Denis until January 1817, when the grandiose ceremony of the return of the all the kings and queens of France was held. After all, a return en masse was much more spectacular. The removal of Louise de Lorraine encapsulated Louis XVIII's attitude towards the cemetery at Père Lachaise as an unsuitable place of royal interment and commemoration, and his preference for the church and the public square.

¹²Jacques Hillairet, *Les 200 cimetières du vieux Paris*, Paris, 1958, p. 325

¹³Archives de la Seine, 3AZ 310 Pièce 4. A. Caillot, *Voyage religieux et sentimental aux quatre cimetières de Paris*, Paris, 1808

The re-establishment of the dynastic tombs at Saint Denis was the symbolic foundation upon which the successful re-instatement of the Bourbon regime rested. As the *Journal des Débats* claimed, the Bourbons took possession of their throne and their tombs at the same time, as the two were symbolically linked. Furthermore, as the *Quotidienne* claimed, 'it is not a vain custom, a casual routine, that assembles under a single roof a whole series of rulers; it is a veritable symbolic institution, by which the permanence of the monarchy is rendered visible to the fickle multitude.'¹⁴ Moreover, in order for the new King to ascend the throne, the dead king had to be properly laid to rest.¹⁵ Therefore, the location of the remains of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette and their re-instatement within the dynastic sepulchre was of the utmost importance and addressed with great haste. For example, the king had entered Paris on May 2, 1814, and by May 22 witnesses were already being interviewed as to the circumstances of the death and interment of Louis XVI in order to search for his remains.¹⁶ The affair was also carried out in as grandiose and public a manner as possible, for as the *Moniteur* announced, if 'all of France had seen their King die, all of France must see, at the same moment, his mortal remains re-appear'¹⁷

¹⁴'Ce n'est pas un vain usage, une routine indifférente, qui rassemble sous une même voûte funèbre toute une série de monarques, c'est une véritable institution symbolique, par laquelle la perpétuité de la monarchie est rendue sensible à la multitude inconstante.' *La Quotidienne*, No. 21, 21 January, 1817

¹⁵'Dieu finit d'un seul coup cette révolution épouvantable et les Rois de France reprennent à la fois possession de leur trône et de leur tombeau.' Quoted in *Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

¹⁶*Moniteur Universel*, No. 21, 21 January, 1815

¹⁷'...toute la France a vu mourir son Roi, toute la France doit voir reparaître au même moment sa dépouille mortelle.' *Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

Both the King and Queen had been guillotined, at different dates, on what is today known as the Place de la Concorde and were buried in unmarked graves in the nearby cemetery of Saint Madeleine along with many other victims. When the cemetery eventually became disused, a M. Descloseaux purchased it and kept the site safe until the return of the Bourbons. The approaching anniversary of Louis XVI's death on January 21, 1793 made the search even more crucial and its success more symbolic. The *Moniteur* gave a detailed and scientific description of the retrieval of the remains of Marie-Antoinette on January 18, 1815, and the those of Louis XVI on the 19th.¹⁸ The translation of remains to Saint Denis took place on 21 January, 1815. The comparison with revolutionary funeral festivals is unavoidable and must have been on the minds of its organizers but the ambiance of this latest procession was however, clearly different. The route itself was symbolic, declared the *Moniteur*, as it had been followed centuries before by Saint Louis.¹⁹ The police ordered an 'extraordinary sweeping' of the streets where the procession was to pass.²⁰ Such a sweep was not merely intended to clear rubbish from the streets, as the festival was intended more as a parade of military power and of government dignitaries, in which the populace was not asked to participate but simply to spectate. The remains of Marie-Antoinette and Louis XVI had been placed in respective coffins and rested on a bier carried by twelve royal body guards.²¹ (ill. 45) The procession passed between two rows of spectators everywhere it went. Order reigned. Silence, gravity and

¹⁸*Moniteur Universel*, No. 21, 21 January, 1815

¹⁹*Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

²⁰*Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

²¹*Moniteur Universel*, No. 23, 23 January, 1815

majestic simplicity replaced the noisy, raucous festivities of revolutionary days. All the regiments of Paris were armed and lined the procession as it passed from its beginning at the Rue d'Anjou all the way to the city gates of Saint Denis. While certainly meant as an act of homage, the military presence was also meant to ensure the desired order and to prevent the escalation of disturbances such as those which occurred when the decorations on the hearse became entangled in a lantern and the crowd shouted an old lynching cry of the revolutionary period, when street lights had been conveniently used for hanging people: 'À la lanterne!'.²² Despite the evidence of such political unrest roused by the translation, its fleeting symbolism made potential tension ephemeral as well. Other gestures, such as the decree that the anniversary of the death of Louis XVI be commemorated year after year with special services and be marked by a day of national mourning every January 21st, were also too fleeting to rouse long-standing indignation.

The importance of the translation, as an act that represented the cornerstone of the reversal of events since 1789 and the legitimization of the reinstatement of the Bourbon monarchy, was illustrated by the commissioning of permanent monuments immortalizing the event. Statues of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette were commissioned in 1816 from the sculptors Edmé Gaulle (1770-1841) and Pierre Petitot (1760-1840) respectively, to complement the reconstructed monuments of the Bourbon rulers at Saint Denis.²³ (ill. 46) Both physically and visually the monuments were intended to reinstate Louis XVI and Marie-

²²Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, 1955, p. 82

²³Archives Nationales, F²¹ 496

Antoinette within the continuum of dynasty and history. The commission stipulated kneeling figures, a position that echoed the traditional aedicular royal tombs of Saint Denis. The tomb of Henry II and Catherine de Médecis dated 1563 to 1570, for example, opposes *gisant* figures below, with kneeling ones above the aedicular structure, all sculpted by Germain Pilon. However, the presence of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette was a much more forcibly realistic one. Their figures, kneeling in front of individual prayer-stools, were intended, not for a position high above, as on the other royal tombs, but at ground level, depicted praying at the base of an altar.²⁴ Their position in front of the proposed altar was never carried out, possibly because both of the models completed in 1817 were deemed unacceptable, in part because of a perceived lack of realism. The position of Gaulle's Louis XVI was criticized as impossible to maintain for any length of time and the folds of Petitot's Marie-Antoinette were thought too repetitive and both figures were found lacking in expression and convincing features.²⁵ Gaulle's statue was not actually completed until 1831, so it is difficult to judge what the final set-up might have looked like. However, the concept of the two statues, life-sized and placed kneeling before an altar, would have dramatically engaged visitors, inviting them to kneel and pray beside them, in an extraordinarily novel manner.

More innovative however was the idea of depicting the translation ceremony itself with a bas-relief by Antoine-François Gérard (1760-1843), placed in a very prominent position in the chapel erected over the site where the remains of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette and

²⁴Archives Nationales, F²¹ 2

²⁵Draft of a letter from the Minister of the Interior to Gaulle and Petitot, Paris, 20 April, 1817. Archives Nationales, F²¹ 2

other victims of the guillotine, had been buried. (ill. 47) The heart of the *Chapelle* is decidedly sober: other than the two free-standing statues of Louis XVI, by François-Joseph Bosio (1768-1845) and Marie-Antoinette by Jean-Pierre Cortot (1787-1843), there is little sculptural decor. (ills. 48 and 49) The pendentives are decorated with bas-reliefs, also by Gérard, representing angels and symbolic religious objects and the only other work is the bas-relief depicting the translation in the arch above the main entrance. The importance of both the reminder of the reality of the physical journey and its symbolic import are illustrated in the bas-relief by a combination of realism and idealization.

The elaborate hearse carrying the remains of the king and queen is the central focus of the scene. Two crowns rest on top of a small pillow and a fringed shroud reveals a pattern of fleurs de lys surrounding a crest with more fleurs de lys. Engravings and descriptions of the event show a certain similarity with the bas-relief, but the twelve guards accompanying the horse drawn hearse in the actual procession have been reduced to four bearers on foot. (ill. 45) While the remains would certainly have been carried into the church at its final destination, it is likely that there is in the relief a reference to the antique practice of shouldering the coffin, which denoted a great honour.²⁶ References to classical antiquity are apparent also in the presence of the draped figures, which replace the largely military procession visible on January 21, 1815. Veiled female mourners swathed in drapery precede the hearse instead of captains and equerries, recalling those women who necessarily accompanied funerals

²⁶Pierre Larousse, 'Funérailles', *Dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle*, vols 1-17, Paris, 1864-1886, vol. 8, 1872, p. 881

in antiquity and were often employed to do so since the more numerous their presence, the greater the status of the event.²⁷ Symbolically, these figures may have been intended to represent the nation's mourning, something which had perhaps been far less apparent on the day, with its cries of 'À la lanterne!'.

Pertinent references to contemporary reality are nonetheless woven throughout the scene. One of the pall bearers' drapery slips away to reveal a uniform, in all likelihood recalling that of the guards who accompanied the hearse. The three children in front of the hearse do not carry symbols of pagan ritual, but of the Catholic mass, including an incense burner, an aspergillum, for sprinkling holy water, and a pyx, presumably containing the host. Behind the procession, the outline of the very top of the central cenotaph of the *Chapelle Expiatoire* is visible above the hearse and to the far right an architectural edifice with gothic arches, designs and clustered columns bears the name of 'Saint Dionysii'. The juxtaposition of the two edifices was purely a symbolic reference as in reality they are physically quite distant from one another and moreover, the first stone of the *Chapelle* had only been laid on the very morning of the procession.

In general, the images of translation and the re-dedication of the basilica at Saint Denis as the burial site of French monarchs seemed to raise few problems or contentions. To begin with, Saint Denis must have seemed quite divorced from the daily life of the capital, situated as it was on the outskirts of the city. Moreover, in general the transformation of interior spaces, such as churches, proved much less problematic than the installation of expiatory monuments on the public

²⁷Pierre Larousse, 'Funérailles', *Dictionnaire universel*, vol. 8, Paris, 1872, p. 878

thoroughfare. Projects for the commemoration of Louis XVI in the public spaces of the capital, where the symbolic meaning of a monument was that much more potent by virtue of its national, centralized character, were made doubly contentious. These tensions were inherent in the project for a national monument to Louis XVI, and the debate over its erection on the Place de la Concorde or within the confines of the adjoining Church of the Madeleine.

Upon his return Louis XVIII had quickly decreed that the squares of Paris should return to their former appellation. Before the Revolution, most of these spaces had borne the names and centred on the monuments of French monarchs, but following 1789, the monuments had been eradicated one after the other. A decree of 19 January, 1816 stipulated the return of each of the deposed monarchs to their original pedestals. It has been assumed therefore that plans for the Place de la Concorde were from the beginning meant to restore the image of Louis XV, whose statue by Bouchardon had once stood there. The space was however heavily tainted with associations that superseded the need for restoring a sense of ancestry and lineage as Louis XVI and his family, along with many others, had been guillotined there. In recognition of this, the square was rededicated to Louis XVI in 1826, but the 1830 revolution prevented the plans from being completed. However, the decision as to whom would stand at the center of the Place was much more complicated than this.

Many historians have neglected a short-lived plan to erect an expiatory monument to Louis XVI on the Place de la Concorde, which pre-dated both the decree of 19 January 1816 (ordering the

reinstatement of Louis XV) and the 1826 project.²⁸ The original project was outlined in January 1815 by Châteaubriand, who announced that the translation of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette to Saint Denis would coincide with the placing of the first stone of a monument to the martyred king on the Place de la Concorde.²⁹ The erection of a monument on the very site of execution exacerbated the sensitive and problematic nature of the project. The *Moniteur* claimed an English precedent for the idea, pointing out that Charles II had erected an equestrian monument to Charles I on the site of his execution.³⁰ The *Moniteur* may have been misinformed as it was actually some of those who had condemned Charles I who had been executed near the site of the monument but nonetheless, the parallel with Charles I was a popular one, cited, for example, several times by Châteaubriand in his

²⁸For example see Bertier de Sauvigny, *Nouvelle Histoire de Paris, La Restauration*, Paris, 1977, p. 68. Bertier de Sauvigny only hints at the possibility that the decision of Charles X in 1826 to dedicate the square to Louis XVI may not have been original: 'Charles X-on ne sait sous quelle inspiration-reprit (my emphasis) l'idée d'y placer un monument à Louis XVI.' No clarification of an earlier project is given. June Hargrove shows no indication of any notion of attributing the space to anyone but Louis XV before 1826. See June Hargrove, *Les Statues de Paris, La Representation des Grands Hommes dans les rues et sur les places de Paris*, Marie-Thérèse Barrett, trad., Anvers and Paris, 1989, p. 58. Even Solange Granet's comprehensive history of the Place does not refer to the earlier project. See 'Le Monument à Louis XVI de la Place de la Concorde', *Revue des arts*, No. IV, December, 1956 and 'Images de Paris: La Place de la Concorde', *La Revue géographique et industrielle de France*, Paris, 1963. The comprehensive 1982 Musée Carnavalet exhibition and catalogue of the history of the Place de la Concorde also neglects the 1815 Louis XVI project. *De la place Louis XV à la place de la Concorde*, Musée Carnavalet, Paris, 1982. However, the project is finally mentioned in a later exhibition, by Franck Folliot, who claims the model for a statue was actually commissioned from the sculpture Taunay. Franck Folliot, 'Les Monuments dynastiques et expiatoires', *La Famille royale à Paris, de l'histoire à la légende*, Musée Carnavalet, Paris, 1993, p. 97.

²⁹Printed in the *Journal des débats*, 19 January 1815 and reprinted in the *Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815.

³⁰*Moniteur Universel*, 20 January, 1815, No. 20.

memoirs.³¹ The quasi-martyr status attributed to Charles I in England could be assimilated for Louis XVI; the successful reinstatement and perpetuation of the British monarchy were comforting to the newly restored Bourbons; and the notion of retribution implicit in the position of the Charles I monument could also be embodied by the Louis XVI monument. Placing the monument on the site of execution was however a double-edged sword, problematized by the manner in which the location had a different significance for different groups. If for the royalists it was the site of ultimate loss and sacrifice, for republicans it was the site of ultimate triumph and victory. The tension inherent in these opposing views of the space was recognized by Châteaubriand, despite the fact that he had originally been a proponent of the monument. He claimed: 'I have long desired that the image of Louis XVI be placed on the very site where the martyr spilled his blood: I am no longer of that opinion...In these times, it is to be feared that a monument erected with the aim of imprinting fear of popular excesses would create the desire to imitate them...'³²

After Napoleon's return for the One Hundred Days in March 1815, perhaps a more politic approach to commemorating Louis XVI seemed advisable, as the public square was exchanged for the privacy of a Church. The law enforcing the erection of a national expiatory monument to Louis XVI, as well as monuments to Louis XVII, Marie-

³¹ John Blackwood, *London's Immortals, The Complete Outdoor Commemorative Statues*, London, 1989, p. 21 and Châteaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, (vols. 1-12, 1849-1850), vols. 1-2, Flammarion edition, Paris, 1951, vol. 1, Book 9, Chapter 4, p. 299 and Book 10, Chapter 5, p. 354

³² 'J'ai désiré assez longtemps que l'image de Louis XVI fût placé dans le lieu même où le martyr répandit son sang: je ne serais plus de cet avis...Par le temps actuel, il serait à craindre qu'un monument élevé dans le but d'imprimer l'effroi des excès populaires donnât le désir de les imiter...' Châteaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, 1951, vol. 1, Book 22, Chapter 25, pp. 906-907s

Antoinette, Mme Elisabeth and the Duc d'Enghien had been adopted by both Chambers unanimously on 17, January 1816 and Louis XVIII was given free reign over the type and location of the monuments.³³

However, only two days later, on 19 January, Louis XVIII reversed the decision to dedicate the Place de la Concorde to Louis XVI, restoring instead all the monarchs to their former squares and on 18 February, 1816, the *Moniteur* announced that the Place de la Concorde would be restored to its former occupant Louis XV.³⁴ The decision reflected the opinion of at least one Peer who on 13 January that year had publicly questioned the soundness of placing an expiatory monument to Louis XVI on a public square altogether. He felt that the monument should be placed within the confines of a temple, or some other place more favourable to meditation.³⁵

The decision to remove Louis XVI from the Place de la Concorde coincided with the official announcement that the Church of the Madeleine, originally begun in 1764, would be completed and transformed into a vast expiatory chapel, with monuments not only to Louis XVI by Bosio, but Marie-Antoinette by Louis Dupaty (1771-1825), Mme. Elisabeth by Ruxthiel (1775-1837) and Louis XVII by François Lemot (1772-1827) as well.³⁶ The decision to seek the sanctuary of the temple rather than the visibility of the public square underlines the problematic nature of the Place de la Concorde, not only because of its significance as the site of execution, but simply by virtue of its public, urban nature. Louis XVIII had recognized that the public square could

³³*Moniteur Universel*, No. 18, 18 January, 1816 and No. 21, 21 January, 1816

³⁴*Moniteur Universel*, No. 49, 18 February, 1816

³⁵*Moniteur Universel*, No. 14, 14 January, 1816

³⁶*Moniteur Universel*, No. 49, 18 February, 1816

in itself be a site of contention and this was again borne out by his decision a year later, in the case of the monument to Bonchamps (ill. 77), leader of the insurrection in the Vendée, when the king, conscious of the possibility of raising negative public feeling, had the monument transferred from the public space to the confines of a church.³⁷

The Place de la Concorde was moreover the focus of a large visual expanse, facing, on one side, the incomplete church of the Madeleine and on the other, across the former Pont Louis XV, the Palais Bourbon and Chamber of Deputies. The monument to Louis XVI would have brought together these various buildings and spaces into a symbolic spatial network. This was significant not only in terms of sheer space, but of history as well. Napoleon himself had envisioned the space as a vast monument to imperial glory, with the Madeleine as a military Valhalla, and the bridge decked out with statues of his glorious generals.³⁸ The Restoration regime re-appropriated the scheme, in all its massive scale, for its own political purposes. If the central monument to Louis XVI was temporarily abandoned in February 1816, the completion of the Church of the Madeleine as an elaborate expiatory building maintained the ideological focus of the spatial network on Bourbon supremacy. The notion of a great royalist network of spaces was illustrated by the simultaneous announcement of the new project for the re-christened Pont Louis XVI, to be decorated with twelve

³⁷L'Aîné, Minister of the Interior notified Baron de Wismes, Prefect of the Maine et Loire on 31 March, 1817 of the King's decision: '...en m'ordonnant de vous transmettre son approbation elle [His Majesty] m'a chargé de vous faire savoir qu'il serait plus convenable et qu'elle préférerait que le monument fût élevé dans l'église que sur une place publique.' Quoted in Suzanne Lindsay, *David d'Angers' Monument to Bonchamps: A Tomb Project in Context*, PhD. Bryn Mawr, 1983, p. 11

³⁸June Hargrove, *Les Statues de Paris*, 1989, p. 58

colossal statues of illustrious figures from Bourbon history.³⁹ The project echoed d'Angevillers historical series of great men started under the *Ancien Regime*, yet the imperial project was also echoed in the military bias of the figures, taking into account the need to compete with the Napoleonic military legend.

Within the network of spaces created by the 1816 decree, with the Madeleine, transformed into a royal expiatory chapel, and the Chamber of Deputies as *repoussoirs* for the vast commemorative urban complex, the focus of the Place de la Concorde was of even greater political significance. This was the space Charles X had to work with when in 1826 he re-instated the plan for a central monument to Louis XVI by Cortot. Balanced by plans for the addition of a statue of Louis XVIII holding the Charter, commissioned that same year from Bosio, in front of the Chamber of Deputies, the space had developed into an even greater network of ideological symbols.⁴⁰ (ill. 50) The establishment of a central monument dedicated to Louis XVI, the balancing of the Palais Bourbon with an expiatory church, the addition of the presence of Louis XVIII, were all assertions of power and domination for both church and monarch. The projected Louis XVI monument, facing directly onto the Chamber of Deputies across the Seine exacerbated tensions between two notions of the nation: one firmly controlled by an absolute monarch and religion, and another of monarchy tempered by the power of elected officials. As such the more imposing nature of the royalist propaganda of the 1826 project reflected the difference between Louis XVIII and

³⁹*Moniteur Universel*, No. 49, 18 February, 1816

⁴⁰For Louis XVIII commission see *Moniteur Universel*, No. 283, 10 October, 1826 and A.N. O⁴ 2185. The project was never completed, but the plaster model is at Versailles.

Charles X. The more prudent and conciliatory political strategy adopted by Louis XVIII was replaced by the more inflexible political views of Charles X, under whose regime the authority of the Church and the Court were more obviously predominant, and whose ideas about royal prerogative and power were firmly at odds with the concept of a parliamentary regime.⁴¹

The first stone of the monument was placed in 1827, as commemorated in a painting by Joseph Beaume (1796-1885) (Musée de Versailles, ill. 51), and by 1830 Cortot's model was complete and awaiting casting at the foundry. The fate of the monument illustrates to what extent it may have embodied the unpopular political attitudes of Charles X and their role in the eventual downfall of the Bourbons as in July 1830 it was the victim of a rare instance of iconoclastic fervour: the moulds and model were destroyed at the foundry by an angry mob. Random destruction of Bourbon imagery was not frequent during the July Revolution and the fate of Cortot's model may single the monument out as a particularly inflammatory one. Luckily for historians, a reduced plaster model has survived and can be found at Versailles, but unfortunately, it is not presently included in the official historical sequence of the museum, with its series of portraits and scenes from French history, but remains hidden from public view in a section of the palace reserved for use by government officials.⁴² (ill. 52)

The only expiatory monument successfully completed under the Restoration was the *Chapelle Expiatoire*. The expiatory monument was announced in January 1815 by the *Moniteur Universel* at the same

⁴¹For the political views of Charles X see Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, 1955, pp. 369-372

⁴²Musée de Versailles (MV 1355A)

time as the Place de la Concorde project, yet it was actually the only one of the major monuments planned for the capital to be completed during the Restoration (in 1826). As discussed above, the Place de la Concorde monument met with a violent end in 1830, and the Madeleine project seemed to progress little over the following years. It was not, as some have claimed, the decision to construct the *Chapelle Expiatoire* that prevented the Madeleine from emerging as an expiatory monument.⁴³ The *Chapelle* had in fact been announced since 1815 and in 1819, the *Moniteur* was still announcing that work at the Madeleine was about to commence, optimistically speculating that they would take a mere four years, but was not until 1828 that works were advanced enough for the pediment sculpture to proceed and a competition was proposed. The delay was in all likelihood due to the large scale of the project, the financial troubles that plagued the Restoration from the very beginning, and the necessity of imposing a rigorous policy of restricted spending that hampered all public works of the period.⁴⁴ While the building was eventually completed, the July Revolution interrupted the decorative scheme that would have transformed it into an expiatory monument. There are those who claim that as a result, some of the sculpture intended for the Madeleine made its way to the *Chapelle Expiatoire*, namely the statues of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette by Bosio and Cortot, but it is doubtful whether any of the Madeleine expiatory

⁴³One historian has claimed that '...lorsque l'élévation de la Chapelle expiatoire fut décidée, il devint inutile de réserver, dans la nouvelle église un cénotaphe à la mémoire de Louis XVI, et la Madeleine redescendit au rang de simple église paroissiale.' P. J., 'Les projets d'Achille Leclère pour l'achèvement de la Madeleine', *Bulletin de la société historique et archéologique des VIIIe et XVIIe arrondissements de Paris*, 1917-1919, p. 82

⁴⁴*Moniteur Universel*, No. 195, 14 July, 1819, *Moniteur Universel*, No. 323, 18 November, 1828, and Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, 1955, p. 85

statues were ever completed.⁴⁵ It is true that Bosio had been given the commission for the Madeleine Louis XVI monument in 1816, but this work had been described in 1816 as a project for a statue of Louis XVI surmounting a tomb and holding out his testament.⁴⁶ Moreover, as early as the 12 December, 1815, Fontaine's plans for the *Chapelle Expiatoire* illustrate a monument clearly resembling the statue by Bosio that eventually was placed there. Complete with winged figure, guiding the arm of another figure, presumably Louis XVI, dressed in antique style armour, a popular convention for royal figures (ill. 55), Fontaine's drawing points to the existence of two separate and distinct monument projects for the Madeleine and the *Chapelle*. Rather than relying on the failure of the Madeleine, the successful completion of the *Chapelle* project was owed in part to its small scale, the fact that it was entirely funded by the royal purse - as opposed to the government funding of the Madeleine - as well as its location and character.

⁴⁵Both J. M. Darnis and Franck Folliot have claimed that the Bosio for the *Chapelle* was originally intended for the Madeleine. Moreover, neither of these authors refers to any sources to substantiate these claims, and in fact, several pages later, Folliot's co-author Philippe Sorel remarks on that very lack of proof in regards to this idea. Darnis also claims the Marie-Antoinette at the *Chapelle* was originally intended for the Madeleine, but that project was originally given to Dupaty, and as Darnis himself point out, after the sculptor's death in 1825, the commission was reallocated to Petitot. The change was officially recorded and Dupaty's name was crossed out and replaced by Petitot's on a document preserved in the Archives Nationales. See Darnis, *Les Monuments expiatoires du supplice de Louis XVI et de Marie-Antoinette sous l'Empire et la Restauration 1812-1830*, Paris, 1981, p. 55 note 14 and 15 and pp.71-72, Folliot, 'Les Monuments dynastiques et expiatoires', p. 105 and Philippe Sorel, 'Les Monuments à Louis XVI aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles', p. 123, *La Famille royale à Paris, de l'histoire à la légende*, Musée Carnavalet, Paris, 1993 and Archives Nationales, F²¹ 496

⁴⁶For commissions see Archives Nationales F²¹ 496 and its announcement in the *Moniteur Universel*, No. 49, 18 February, 1816. For description of Louis XVI statue for the Madeleine see *Église de la Madeleine, Monuments expiatoires, Idées générales sur l'exécution de la Loi et ordonnance du mois de janvier 1816*, Ministère de l'Intérieur, 29 January 1816. A. N. F²¹ 582

Designed by the architects Pierre Fontaine (1762-1853) and Charles Percier, the *Chapelle* is actually a small complex of buildings and open spaces, built on two levels. A small building serves as a vestibule, leading up to the main courtyard, with porticos along either side. (ill. 53) At the far end is a small chapel on a Greek cross plan. (ills. 54 and 55) Here also the conciliatory strategy of removing expiatory monuments from the dangers of the public space adopted by Louis XVIII are discernible. The site of the *Chapelle* was not to begin with a great thoroughfare such as the Place de la Concorde, and no real effort seems to have been made to transform it into a prominent, visible or accessible one. It is true that the entrance to the square, Rue de la Madeleine was enlarged, but in general the surrounding work seems to have reflected a strategy of isolation and concealment.⁴⁷ In December of 1815, the *Moniteur* described the porticos that were intended to encircle the complex, as well as the paths and trees, 'isolating this monument from the neighbouring houses'.⁴⁸

This more isolated position reflected the edifice's ostensibly different character from that of the monument in the public square. In the public sphere, as Châteaubriand had recognized, a funeral character and atmosphere were undesirable: 'A funerary altar in the middle of the Place Louis XV would not have been appropriate in any way. This square is a great road of sorts where the crowds pass as they race to their amusements, or to display its vanities. Amidst the distractions our weak heart are disposed to, joyous accents would have profaned too often a monument of grief. No, no Frenchman will be obliged to go out

⁴⁷For enlargement of entrance see *Moniteur Universel*, No. 21, 21 January, 1825

⁴⁸*Moniteur Universel*, No. 360, 26 December, 1815

of his way to avoid the presence or the sight of the projected monument.⁴⁹ In contrast, the funereal nature of the *Chapelle Expiatoire* was clearly articulated in both its form and decoration from its very conception. In January 1815, when the idea was first announced and before any design was actually set upon, Châteaubrand claimed, the monument would represent an 'antique tomb' in the form of a cross, lit from above by a dome.⁵⁰ In his memoirs, Châteaubriand later linked the completed monument to Renaissance sepulchral chapels, particularly one at Rimini. He also saw in the monument, as he put it, an imitation of a tomb by the Bolognese, probably referring to Michelangelo's New Sacristy at San Lorenzo for the Medici family (1520-1524), a square plan surmounted by a dome, very much like the central portion of the main chapel of the *Expiatoire* complex.⁵¹

The funereal nature of the complex was further articulated by similarities with other famous funereal architectural monuments such as Giovanni Pisano's Campo Santo at Pisa. (ill. 56) The central courtyard of the *Chapelle* is lined on either side by galleries. Access to the galleries is actually situated at a lower level, and from the courtyard one views a succession of arches, through which the length of the gallery can be glimpsed. The use of a central courtyard was an ingenious way for Fontaine to solve the problem of incorporating all the

⁴⁹'Un autel funèbre au milieu de la Place Louis XV, n'eut été convenable sous aucun rapport. Cette place est une espèce de grand chemin où la foule passe pour courir à ses plaisirs, ou pour étaler ses vanités. Dans les distractions naturelles à la faiblesse de nos coeurs, les accents de la joie auraient trop souvent profané un monument de douleur. Non, aucun Français ne sera obligé de détourner ses pas ou ses regards du monument projeté.' *Journal des débats*, 19 January 1815 and reprinted in the *Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

⁵⁰*Journal des débats*, 19 January 1815 and reprinted in the *Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

⁵¹Châteaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, 1951, vol. 1, Book 22, Chapter 25, note a, p. 905, p. 1112

displaced earth from the original cemetery into the project. Fontaine had been forced to conserve this earth, still venerated for the royal remains it had briefly harboured, and for the remains of the victims that were still in it. By the incorporation of a raised central courtyard the reserved earth could be used to fill this space in. This also resulted in the split-level design, with the entrance and galleries at the lower level and the courtyard and chapel at the upper level. The far chapel was also given a crypt as a result of the space available below it. Fontaine's practical solution was also surely influenced by the popularity of the concept in funerary architecture of a covered arcaded cloister surrounding a central open space. The idea had been planned at Père Lachaise and harkened back to the most famous precedent of the Campo Santo. In fact, the central courtyard at Pisa serves a very similar function as at the *Chapelle*, as the earth it contains was similarly sanctified, having been brought back from the Holy Land. Three chapels adjoin the cloister of the Campo Santo, at least one of which, the oldest on the east side, is domed, as is the Chapelle Expiatoire at the far end of the courtyard. Funerary monuments lined the inside walls of the surrounding porticos of the Campo Santo, as well as in the central space and at the Chapelle Expiatoire a series of tombstones, monuments consecrated to the memory of the victims of the revolution who had been buried in the cemetery of Ste. Madeleine were planned for the area under the arcades. The result is a line of unmarked, symbolic tombs along the sides of the central courtyard, whose only ornamentation consists of a ribboned circular wreath on the headstone, a popular funereal motif echoed throughout the entire complex. (ill. 57)

The subdued decoration is in fact funereal in nature throughout, comprised of a few wreaths, winged hourglasses and inverted torches (which actually serve to conceal the drainpipes evacuating rainwater⁵²). Wreaths entwined with ribbons have decorated tombs since antiquity (ill. 58), winged-hourglasses represent the passage of time and the ineluctability of death, while the inverted torches refer to extinguished life, all popular ornamentation for tombs of the period. The facade of the entrance vestibule itself recreates a square antique sarcophagus, tipped with acroteria and with a central doorway. This was a popular form for neo-classical tombs, many examples of which could be seen at Père Lachaise, Delille's tomb being one of the most famous. At the *Chapelle*, Christian symbolism was superimposed upon the funereal decoration, as in the pediment which bears a wreath in the center, encircling the Christian monograph, IHS. (ill. 54) In this context the two nude winged figures in an attitude of prayer, on either side of the monogram are presumably angels rather than simply classical genii. Inside the religious symbolism is re-iterated in each of the four pendentives below the cupola which are decorated with reliefs by Gérard representing angels with various religious emblems.⁵³ (ill. 59) Even the isolation of the complex from the outside world, thanks to gates, vegetation and pathways, was perceived as instrumental in achieving that religious character.⁵⁴ The building was indeed meant to function as a religious edifice, as Louis XVIII placed two priests in

⁵²Maurice Fouché, *Les Grands artistes, Percier et Fontaine*, Paris, 1905, p. 103

⁵³*Two Angels with the Emblems of the Trinity, Two Angels Kneeling Before the Tablets of the Ten Commandments, Two Angels in Adoration Before the Sacrament, Two Angels Before the Paschal Lamb*. See *Inventaire générale des richesses d'Art de la France, Paris, Monuments Civils*, vol. 2, Paris, 1889, pp. 356-359

⁵⁴*Moniteur Universel*, No. 360, 6 December. 1816

charge of the upkeep of the lamps and altars and arranged for masses to be performed there in perpetuity.⁵⁵

The *Chapelle* was also more than just a symbolic cemetery, but a functional one as well, harbouring the remains of a number of revolutionary victims who had not like Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette been transferred elsewhere. At the *Chapelle* however, the fundamental concept of the extra-mural cemetery established in the late Eighteenth Century, reverted back to an urban model and a model focusing on the figure of the monarch, as it had in the eighteenth-century Academy of Architecture projects, in opposition with the cemetery at Père Lachaise, established as a suburban, secular space, whose stylistic precedents were, not religious edifices as at the *Chapelle*, but gardens and woods. The distinct similarity between the entrance to the complex of the *Chapelle Expiatoire* and the new entrance to the Père Lachaise by Étienne Hippolyte Godde (1781-1869), built during the Restoration, may point to the Regime's desire to impose official commemorative policy on the cemetery. (ill. 60) Like the entrance to the *Chapelle*, the cemetery entrance on the Boulevard du Ménilmontant is flanked by two cenotaphs, and even decorated in a similar manner, with the motif of a winged hourglass surrounded by wreaths, wreaths hanging in half-circles below and finished off on either side by inverted torches. In addition, there are scriptural texts inscribed on both cenotaphs. The design may have been a common one for cemetery entrances and perhaps inspired by Brongniart, whose watercolour plans for the cemetery show two different conceptions for the entrance. One was a heavier design, made up of two sarcophagi on either side of a triangular,

⁵⁵*Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

pediment-like structure, with an arched doorway in the center, but the second design was clearly the source for Godde's entrance, showing the same semi-circular format, with two *cippes*, on either side of the doorway, decorated with wreaths, inverted torches and what seems to be text, which may or may not have been taken from the scriptures, as in Godde's design. (ills. 61 and 62)

The imposition of a religious, denominational character upon the cemetery during this period is however quite clearly articulated in Godde's design for the central chapel. Brongniart's design for the chapel was less inclined towards asserting a dominant Christian ideology. Brongniart's chapel, in the shape of a colossal pyramid, echoed eighteenth-century Enlightenment architectural trends, exemplified by the work of Boullée. (ills. 61 and 62) The form of the chapel was more suited to pervasive deist beliefs rather than establishing the supremacy of any particular cult. Godde's chapel, on the other hand, was erected in 1821 specifically as a Catholic chapel, in a style not all together different from that of the *Chapelle Expiatoire* vestibule, establishing a clear religious context for the cemetery, which can be interpreted as an attempt to impose a religious focus on what was still a secular, non-denominational space. (ill. 63)

The reassertion of religion in the context of commemoration publicly displayed the link between the authority of the Bourbon monarchy and that of the Church. This was further illustrated by the iconography of the monuments dedicated to Louis XVI in the public square, the church and the cemetery complex of the *Chapelle* which were not only consistently associated with religious symbolism but also attempted to create an image of Louis XVI as martyr. This image

served as a counterpart to the cult of revolutionary martyrs and commemorative practices in general after 1789 and as a re-establishment of official commemoration within the confines of religious practice. So pervasive was this movement that the notion of sainthood itself was widely suggested in both the text and imagery associated with the monuments, going so far as to attempt to create links between Louis XVI and Christ, the ultimate martyr.

The reinstated monuments of Henri IV by Lemot (1817, ill. 64) on the Place Dauphine, Louis XIII by Cortot (1829, ill. 65) on the Place de Vosges and Louis XIV by Bosio (1822) on the Place des Victoires all reiterated the military bias of their predecessors in their equestrian poses, military or imperial roman costume. In contrast the nature of the Bourbon expiatory monuments were highly religious images concentrating on portraying victims and martyrs. The image of military victory of the other royal monuments was transformed in the case of Louis XVI into one of spiritual victory, by consistent reference to his heavenly reward and ascension towards heaven, illustrated through a number of gestures and symbols. In some cases Louis is guided by the figure of an angel, as described by Châteaubriand when the monument for the Place de la Concorde was originally announced in 1815. The angel whispers in Louis' ear the words attributed to the Abbé Edgewood at the scaffold that day, 'Son of Saint Louis, ascend to heaven'.⁵⁶ The architect Fontaine had been placed in charge of a variety of the expiatory projects that year, including those for the Place de la Concorde and he claims to have hired the sculptor Auguste Taunay (1767-1824) to produce the monument to Louis XVI, which he

⁵⁶*Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

described as including the guiding angel.⁵⁷ Not coincidentally this was the image Bosio chose to produce for the *Chapelle* statue, proving that despite the changes of plans, sites and sculptors there continued to be a consistent iconographical program. (ill. 48) While the 1826 Cortot project for the Place de la Concorde dropped the angel, the concept of heavenly ascent and reward was maintained. In the drawing by Duvivier, which records Cortot's initial ideas (ill. 66), in Cortot's final version of the monument (ill. 52) and also in Bosio's statue for the *Chapelle* (ill. 48), Louis raises his eyes and gestures with one hand towards heaven. Clouds were also a popular means of signifying the heavenly ascent in the monuments. In 1815, Fontaine had described the angel floating on a bed of clouds and in both Duvivier's drawing of 1826 (ill. 66) and Cortot's final version of the monument (ill. 52), Louis does indeed stand on a bed of clouds.⁵⁸

This type of religious imagery, more traditionally associated with church and funereal monuments was very unusual for a public space such as the Place de la Concorde and there were those who felt that it was unsuitable, by proposing plans for the Place more imbued with the triumphant character of traditional royal monuments in the capital. In 1815 for example, the architect J.- B. de Deban wrote to Châteaubriand and claimed that a triumphal arch was more appropriate, proposing a *Porte Louis XVI*, like the triumphal *Porte Saint Denis* established by Louis XIV, at the end of the projected bridge leading from the Place to

⁵⁷Pierre-François-Léonard Fontaine, *Journal 1799-1853*, 2 vols., Paris, 1987, vol. 1, p. 440. After the project was dropped in 1816, Taunay departed for Brazil that same year, where he died in 1824. Stanislas Lami, *Dictionnaire des sculpteurs de l'école française au dix-neuvième siècle*, vols. 1-4, Paris, 1914-1921, vol. 4, 1921, p. 285

⁵⁸Fontaine, *Journal 1799-1853*, vol. 1, Paris, 1987, p. 440

the Palais Bourbon⁵⁹, and in 1819, Deban exhibited a project for a monument glorifying Louis XVI at the Salon (No. 1565). Two unattributed views of just such an arch exist, which may indeed be by Deban. An anonymous watercolour at the Musée Carnavalet shows the view facing the Palais Bourbon, while another image at the Bibliothèque Nationale shows the view towards the Place de la Concorde, complete with a, presumably royal, equestrian monument (perhaps the projected Louis XV monument).⁶⁰ (ill. 67) The triumphal mode was a tried and tested one, but the choice to concentrate on a religious iconographic scheme even in the public space reveals a much more subtle but widespread Bourbon propaganda campaign, which was aimed at countering commemorative practices developed after 1789.

After the Revolution methods of suggesting glorification for secular achievement as opposed to Christian virtues had been developed. The process of Pantheonization, the cult of revolutionary martyrs such as Marat and Lepelletier de Saint-Fargeau had largely appropriated Church practices, replacing religious saints, martyrs and Christian apotheosis. Religious significance was replaced by a concept of secular glorification and the meaning of apotheosis had in many instances been encompassed by that of literary celebrations in various forms such as the *eulogy*. In 1793 for example a lyrical stage production by Delrieu and set to music by Giroux was entitled the *Apotheosis of Marat and Lepelletier*. The following year J. F. Barrau produced a tragedy in three acts entitled the *Death of Marat* followed by his

⁵⁹J.-B. de Deban, 'Lettre à Châteaubriand de l'architecte J.-B. de Deban sur le Monument Louis XVI', *Journal Royal*, 8 March, 1815

⁶⁰Anon., *Project for a Monument to Louis XVI*, Musée Carnavalet D 2978 and Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Estampes Department. Va 227 vol. 1., Microfilm H 58702

Apotheosis in one act.⁶¹ Under Napoleon, images such as Girodet's *Ossian receiving the Napoleonic Officers* (1802, ill. 68) depicting French commanders received into a Valhalla, re-enforced the theme of merited glorification as opposed to Christian religious canonization. Napoleonic propaganda also reinstated the roman imperial concept of apotheosis, based on the notion of deification.⁶²

While quite different from the military implications of the equestrian monuments and arches, images of heavenly ascension were nonetheless triumphal in nature by their association with the notion of apotheosis. Apotheosis imagery had in fact^{been} adopted by the Bourbon regime across the board as the ideal commemorative mode for all of its members. An engraving of the *Apotheosis of Marie-Antoinette* is remarkably similar to the format of the Louis XVI monuments, with an angel pointing and guiding the Queen towards heaven.⁶³ This iconographic formula was also adopted for the Duc de Berry, after his assassination in 1820, which was blamed on the liberals, and again for Louis XVIII, victim only to his own obesity.⁶⁴ Louis XVI was naturally most frequently depicted in apotheosis. Engravings of the subject were numerous and would certainly have been one of the most widely circulated forms of apotheosis imagery. (ills. 69 and 70) Paintings of

⁶¹J. F. Barrau, *La Mort de Marat, Tragédie en trois actes et en vers, suivie de Son Apothéose en un acte, et en vers*, Toulouse, 1794

⁶²For example, A. Appiani, *Apotheosis of Napoleon* painted for the imperial palace in Milan. See P. Barboglio, *Fastes de Napoléon, peints par A. Appiani*, (1854)

⁶³Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes. Qb1 (16 Octobre 1793)

⁶⁴For the Duc de Berry apotheosis imagery, see Armand Dayot, *La Restauration: Louis XVIII à Charles X, d'après l'image du temps*, (Paris, n.d.), p. 49. For Louis XVIII, see engraving by Bosselman after Desenne and Rullman, of the *Apotheosis of Louis XVIII*, Musée Carnavalet.

the subject were equally popular, as an 1817 review of the Salon pointed out:

'The apotheosis of Louis XVI has been represented several times this year with little success. The public has not seen the beautiful painting where M. Monsiau depicts Louis XVI rising towards heaven.'⁶⁵

Monsiau's painting re-iterated the image planned for the expiatory monuments, depicting Louis XVI guided to heaven by an angel.⁶⁶ Other works on the subject at the Salon included François Dumont's *Apotheosis of Louis XVI, the Queen, Louis XVII and H.R.H. Mme. Elisabeth*.

Proposals for the Madeleine revolved around similar themes of apotheosis. When the completion of the Madeleine was announced, Vignon the original architect of the church had already promulgated such a project in 1816, in the hopes of continuing the work himself, with a proposal which included a pediment decorated with the apotheosis of Louis XVI.⁶⁷ Vignon was successful and in January 1816 the apotheosis of Louis XVI was briefly officially adopted as the subject of the pediment.⁶⁸ Later that year, the decision was made to drop the apotheosis as the sculptor Gérard was commissioned to produce a figure

⁶⁵'L'apothéose de Louis XVI a été traité plusieurs fois cette année avec peu de succès. Le public n'a pas vu le beau tableau où M. Monsiau a représenté Louis XVI montant au ciel.' M. M***, (Edme Miel), *Essai sur le Salon de 1817 ou Examen critique des principaux ouvrages dont l'exposition se compose, avec gravures au trait*, Paris, 1817, p. 243

⁶⁶See engraving in Miel, *Essai sur le Salon de 1817*, Paris, 1817.

⁶⁷Vignon, *Monuments commémoratifs projetés en l'honneur de Louis XVI et sa famille*, Paris, 1816

⁶⁸*Église de la Madeleine, Monuments expiatoires, Idées générales sur l'exécution de la Loi et ordonnance du mois de janvier 1816*, Ministère de l'Intérieur, 29 January 1816. A. N. F²¹ 582

of Religion and two angels instead.⁶⁹ However in November 1828, the plan was once again rerouted as an impending competition for the pediment group was announced and the idea of representing the apotheosis of Louis XVI resurfaced.⁷⁰

The contest for the bas-relief was officially announced in March 1829 and contestants were asked to portray a scene from the life of the Magdalen, or any other subject appropriate to the pious destination of the royal church.⁷¹ According to the critic Jal, the pious objective being an expiatory monument to Louis XVI and the royal family, a 'Louis XVI subject was implied' and eight out of the 25 contestants complied, depicting not Mary Magdalen, whose name the church bears, but Louis XVI among the saints.⁷² Out of the 27 entries, 6 contestants were short-listed, including the *Apotheosis of Louis XVI* by Raymond Gayrard (1777-1858).⁷³ It was Lemaire's *Triumph of Faith: Christ with the Magdalen at his feet* that won, but there was nonetheless a push to maintain the apotheosis imagery by installing Gayrard's group on the back pediment. The jury of the contest seemed inclined towards such an idea, and it received the support of the so-called *Dauphine* - as the Duchesse de Berry was known - among others.⁷⁴

⁶⁹For Gérard commission see A.N. F¹³ 1152.

⁷⁰*Moniteur Universel*, No. 323, 18 November, 1828

⁷¹*Moniteur Universel*, No. 65, 6 March, 1829 and Jal, 'Concours pour le fronton de l'Eglise de la Madeleine. Exposition de 27 esquisses à l'École des Beaux-arts', *Journal du génie civil et des arts*, vol. 4, 1829, p. 187

⁷²Jal, 'Concours pour le fronton de l'Eglise de la Madeleine. Exposition de 27 esquisses à l'École des Beaux-arts', *Journal du génie civil et des arts*, vol. 4, 1829, p. 189

⁷³Léon Gruel, *La Madeleine depuis son établissement à la Ville-l'Évêque*, Paris, 1910, p. 141

⁷⁴A. N. F¹³ 1152

Alexandre Pierre Vignon (1763-1828), the architect chosen in 1816 to complete the church had died in May 1828, and the change in strategy may partially be attributed to the new architect Jean Jacques Marie Huvé. However, the iconographic program called for and elicited by the 1829 contest also reflected the more conservative, ultra-royalist bent of the reign of Charles X. The more conciliatory political strategy adopted by Louis XVIII, which had resulted in the removal of the expiatory monument to Louis XVI from the public space in February 1816, may also have been responsible for the decision not to publicly display a similarly contentious subject on the prominent pediment of the Madeleine. By deciding to erect the Place de la Concorde monument, Charles X had already demonstrated that he was less cautious than his brother, and the resurgence of the apotheosis subject in 1829 equally reflected political changes and the more powerful and prominent position of both Church and Court.

The subject of the apotheosis of Louis XVI also differed significantly from that of the other members of the royal family in that it became almost interchangeable with the concept of canonization. In 1815, Deban had suggested that the soffit of his proposed arch for the Place de la Concorde be decorated with a relief of the 'radiant apotheosis of the sainted king'.⁷⁵ The two unattributed views of an arch that might be by Deban, mentioned above, do seem to have an apotheosis scene in the soffit of the arch, particularly visible in the Bibliothèque Nationale view.⁷⁶ The topic once again surfaced in relation to the expiatory monuments when in 1816 the Minister of the

⁷⁵'Lettre à Châteaubriand de l'architecte J.-B. de Deban sur le Monument Louis XVI', *Journal Royal*, 8 March, 1815

⁷⁶Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes, Va. 277, vol. 1, Microfilm H58702

Interior decreed the decorative scheme for the Madeleine, which included paintings in the arches behind each of the expiatory monuments organized in an arc in the apse. Girodet was commissioned to paint the canvas for Louis XVI, but the artists were given free reign to propose relevant subjects pertaining to the person they had been assigned. It hardly seems surprising that Girodet's letter to the Minister of the Interior in July 1816 suggested the 'apotheosis of the martyr-king'.⁷⁷ In the margin he may have even noted the title as *The Apotheosis of Saint Louis XVI*.⁷⁸ The king himself objected to the title on the grounds that it could be construed as identical with the idea of beatification, the first step towards official canonization, and that it was the Pope's place to initiate such an honour. The title was therefore changed to *The Admission of Louis XVI into Heaven Where He is Received by Saint Louis*.⁷⁹ In 1829, in relation to the contest for the pediment of the Madeleine, with the implication of a Louis XVI subject, Jal had astutely asked if there was perhaps: 'the intention to foreshadow the canonization of the monarch and will the church of the Magdalen soon take the name of Saint Magdalen and Saint Louis?'⁸⁰ Such references were sustained by a Restoration movement campaigning for the official canonization of Louis XVI, which was even discussed periodically in the Chambers of the Peers and the Deputies. In 1816 for example a *Projet d'Apothéose à la mémoire de Louis XVI*

⁷⁷Fonds Grille 1271, Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers.

⁷⁸ See H. Jouin, 'L'Église de la Madeleine en 1816', *Nouvelles archives de l'art français*, 3rd series, vol. 3, No. 8, August, 1887, p. 269

⁷⁹Fonds Grille 1271, Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers.

⁸⁰Jal, 'Concours pour le fronton de l'Eglise de la Madeleine. Exposition de 27 esquisses à l'École des Beaux-arts', *Journal du génie civil et des arts*, vol. 4, 1829, p. 187

was sent to the Chamber of Peers by an author who presented Christian apotheosis as a necessary complement to the tangible honours such as monuments.⁸¹ In 1829, *Considérations sur la mort de Louis XVI pour servir à la béatification et canonisation de ce saint roi* reiterated the desire for official canonization.⁸² Rome may have failed to promote Louis XVI officially, but the process of transformation into an unofficial saint was quite publicly expressed and promoted by the projects for monuments to the memory of Louis XVI.

In 1815, Châteaubriand in the *Moniteur Universel*, had referred to soon to be exhumed remains of Louis XVI as the 'relics of the martyr emerging triumphantly from the ground in order to protect henceforth our nation and to attract through their intercession the benediction of heaven upon all Frenchmen', appropriating for Louis powers of intercession traditionally associated with saints.⁸³ The notion of beatification was most consistently promoted in relation to commemorative monuments to Louis XVI and the idea was even put forward under the Empire in 1814. Confusing the site of the temple begun for the glory of the *Grande Armée*, the future Madeleine, and the cemetery of the Madeleine, where Louis XVI had been buried, one author promoted the idea of transforming the building into a great tomb for the martyr whose remains he believed were located there. Even before the return of the Bourbons, this author qualified Louis as a saintly martyr 'whom the public had qualified a *Saint*, even before the

⁸¹G. De M., *Projet d'apothéose à la mémoire de Louis XVI*, Paris, 1816

⁸²*Considérations sur la mort de Louis XVI pour servir à la béatification et canonisation de ce saint roi*, 1829

⁸³'...les reliques du martyre sortant triomphant du sein de la terre pour protéger désormais notre patrie et attirer par leur intercession la bénédiction du ciel sur tous le Français.' Châteaubriand, *Journal des débats*, reprinted in *Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 Janvier 1815

Church accorded him the title'.⁸⁴ In 1817, a proposed inscription for a monument to Louis XVI for the Place de la Concorde included the following:

'Soon, without a doubt, the religion of our fathers,...will consecrate, by more durable monuments, the undying memory of this Christian hero...it will decorate the venerated statues of this royal martyr, with glorious palms, with immortal crowns and will allow us to erect...a temple and altars...under the all-powerful invocation, of the worthy son of Saint Louis.'⁸⁵

Again in 1826, as the Place de La Concorde monument was being inaugurated the *Moniteur* claimed that: 'Louis no longer appears simply as a sacred mediator between heaven and France. His temples will be in our hearts while we await religious permission to elevate them next to those of Saint Louis.'⁸⁶ The image of sacred mediator was adopted as the subject of at least one public monument dedicated to Louis XVI in Montpellier, by the sculptor Valois, described in the Salon catalogue of 1827 as depicting Louis XVI imploring heaven on behalf of France.⁸⁷ The physical erection of expiatory monuments was in itself perceived

⁸⁴J. G. Dentu, *Le Nouvel Elysée, ou projet du monument à la mémoire de Louis XVI et des plus illustres victimes de la Révolution*, Paris, 1814, pp. 11-12

⁸⁵'Bientôt sans doute, la religion de nos pères,...consacrera, par de plus solides monuments, l'impérissable mémoire de ce héros chrétien...elle ornera les statues vénérés de ce roi martyr, de palmes glorieuses, d'immortelles couronnes et nous permettra d'élever...un temple et des autels...sous l'invocation toute puissante du digne fils de Saint Louis.' Durand *Projet d'embellissement de la Place Louis XV, Quelques idées sur l'inscription qui doit accompagner le monument à élever à la mémoire de Louis XVI et projet d'inscription pour ce monument*, Paris, 1817

⁸⁶'Louis XVI ne nous apparaît plus que comme un médiateur sacré entre le ciel et la France. Ses temples seront dans nos coeurs en attendant que la religion permette de lui en élever à côté de saint Louis.' *Moniteur Universel*, No. 225, 5 May, 1826

⁸⁷The statue did not actually appear at the Salon as it was difficult to transport, but the catalogue pointed out that visitors could see it at the artist's studio from noon until 4 p.m.

by some as a tacit form of beatification, as the reification of the idea of apotheosis. This link is illustrated by an engraving depicting Louis XVI ascending to heaven, aided by an angel, as in the descriptions for the Place de la Concorde monument and in Bosio's statue for the *Chapelle* (ill. 48), but in addition he is rising from an altar or pedestal, shaped like the base of a statue, with a figure of France at standing beside it.⁸⁸ (ill. 70) The implication seems to be that France, in erecting an expiatory monument to Louis XVI is literally enabling his apotheosis.

The discourse of martyrdom and canonization was reflected in the iconographical programs of the expiatory monuments in a variety of ways. Cortot's final version of the monument for the Place de la Concorde included Louis holding the martyr's palm, a symbol which had not appeared in the 1826 drawing. (ill. 52) Even the four personifications of virtues around the base can be interpreted as part of the process of unofficial beatification. Justice (ill. 71), Benevolence (ill. 73) and Piety (ill. 72), three of the personifications on the monument, were frequently promoted in literature and pictorial imagery, as in January 1815, when Châteaubriand had opened his official announcement and description of the plans for the Place de la Concorde monument with allusions to some of those very qualities in Louis XVI:

'From the beginning of his reign, Louis XVI had abolished statutory forced labour, improved the administrative branches, enhanced the glory of our naval forces, and made our victories on the coast of India and America resound. In the midst of the storm of Revolution...everyone was so convinced of his virtues that he

⁸⁸ Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes, N2, Louis XVI Portraits, Microfilm D196905

became known, by common consent, as *the finest man in the kingdom*.⁸⁹

Paintings exhibited at the Salon echoed the same strategies inherent in the proposed statue of Louis XVI. Louis' sense of justice was further illustrated in Berthon's *Act of Justice of H. M. Louis XVI*, exhibited in 1817. The sea having retreated from the coast of the old French province of Guienne - which in the Twelfth Century had formed, along with Gascony, the Duchy of Aquitaine - had yielded a new area of land. According to law, this land belonged to the monarch but the inhabitants of the coast felt that they had a right to the property. The case was brought before the king's Council, and Louis decided in favour of the coastal residents. The painting was commissioned by Louis XVIII himself, desirous of promoting a benevolent, just image of the monarchy.⁹⁰ The piety of Louis XVI had been illustrated at the Salon of 1814 by the exhibition of François-Jean Garnerey's *Louis XVI at the Temple Prison* (No. 411). Separated from his family and deprived of walks in the garden, Louis XVI had been limited to strolling along the terraces above the central tower of the Temple. In the painting, he leans meditatively on one of the crenellations bordering the terraces, with a devotional book lying nearby.⁹¹ At the same Salon Louis

⁸⁹'Louis XVI, dès le commencement de son règne, avait aboli les corvées, amélioré les branches de l'administration, relevé sur la mer la gloire de nos armes, et fait retentir nos victoires sur les côtes de l'Inde et de l'Amérique. Au milieu des orages de la Révolution...on fut si persuadé de ses vertues, qu'on le nomma d'une commune voix *le plus honnête homme de son royaume*.' Châteaubriand, excerpt from the *Journal des Débats* and reprinted in the *Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

⁹⁰See Salon Catalogue 1817.

⁹¹Similar ideas were also associated with images of other members of the royal family as in Alexandre Menjaud's *Marie Antoinette Receiving the Last Sacrament*, dated 1819 and Fleury Richard's, *Mme. Elisabeth de France distribuant du lait*, Salon 1817, a charitable act she was apparently in the habit of repeating daily at her Montreuil residence. See Catalogue of the 1817 Salon and Robert Rosenblum, '

Hersent illustrated the benevolent character of the king with *Louis XVI distributing alms to the poor* (No. 414).

When compared with the strategy quite overtly adopted by publications such as Démonville's *Vertus, esprit et grandeur du bon roi Louis XVI*, these displays of the virtues of Louis XVI emerge as a means of establishing the injustice of the king's death, the purity and innocence of his character, promoting the notion saintly martyrdom. In his publication, Démenonville dedicated several opening pages to the discussion of Louis' sensitivity, filial piety, humanity, goodness etc. His intention is made clear by the words 'if all this does not yet justify the saintly crown he seems to have obtained...', and the further addition of two hundred or so pages describing a variety of virtuous acts performed by Louis during his lifetime.⁹² This lengthy panegyric was intended purely as a justification for the beatification of Louis XVI, which takes place in the conclusion, when 'God looked down on earth with a fatherly gaze and deigned to bless it in favour of its new saint. Louis Auguste of France.'⁹³

In the past, the erroneous identification by historians of the fourth personification on the Cortot monument as a figure of Moderation has served to obscure this link between the display of Louis' supposed virtues and the unofficial establishment of his sainthood.⁹⁴ (ill. 74) In

Painting During the Bourbon Restoration, 1814-1830', *French Painting 1774-1830, The Age of Revolution*, Detroit, 1975, pp. 231-232

⁹²'...et si tout cela ne justifie pas encore la Couronne de Sainteté qu'il paroît avoir obtenue...' Démonville, *Vertus, esprit et grandeur du bon roi Louis XVI*, Paris, 1816, p7

⁹³'Le Seigneur a regardé la terre d'un regard paternel, et a daigné la bénir en faveur de son nouveau saint, Louis Auguste de France.' Démonville, *Vertus*, Paris, 1816, p.206

⁹⁴For example, two of the most comprehensive studies of the project by Solange Granet identified the figure as Moderation, 'Le Monument à Louis XVI de la Place de la Concorde', *Revue des arts*, No. IV, December, 1956, p. 238 and 'Images de Paris:

1828, the records of the Ministry of the Interior listed the figures of the monument as representing two moral virtues, Justice and Benevolence and two religious virtues, Piety and Tolerance, rather than Moderation.⁹⁵ Justice is easily recognizable by her scales and a pose which indicates she may have once held a sword in the other hand. (ill. 71) Earlier photographs show that Benevolence once held wheat in one hand and a bag of coins in the other. (ill. 73) Piety looks heavenward and holds a hand to her breast. (ill. 72) The fourth figure sits demurely, hands crossed in her lap, with no attributes, leading Granet and others to assume she was a figure of Moderation.⁹⁶ (ill. 74) Moderation, implying lack of extremes or excess, is not completely inappropriate within the context of the monument but the figure of Tolerance illuminates the role played by these figures both in reforming the image of monarchy and in promoting the rhetoric of martyrdom and beatification. The issue of religious intolerance had long been one of the crucial criticisms of the *Ancien Regime* and the figure of Tolerance promoted a historical narrative of acceptance and sufferance of other belief systems. Cortot's figure of Tolerance physically illustrates her restraint, as one hand crosses over the other wrist, as if to refrain from

La Place de la Concorde', *La Revue géographique et industrielle de France*, Paris, 1963, p. 101. The mistake has been perpetuated since by subsequent publications relying on Granet, such as June Hargrove, *Les Statues de Paris*, 1989, p. 58.

⁹⁵2 figures-vertues morales: la Justice, la Bienfaisance, 2 figures-vertues religieuses: la Piété, la Tolérance'. Ministère de l'Intérieur, Paris, 14 March, 1828. A. N. F21 575. An earlier article by Robert Anchel did however identify the figures correctly, based on archival documents. See Robert Anchel, 'La Commémoration des rois de France à Paris pendant la Restauration', *Mémoires de la Société d'Histoire de Paris*, vol. XLVII, 1924, p. 206

⁹⁶Jean-Marie Darnis has actually identified the figure of Benevolence as Moderation, but then the photograph he has used no longer includes the tell-tale remnants of wheat in one hand which signify benevolence. As a result Darnis has identified the figure of Tolerance as Benevolence instead. *Les Monuments expiatoires du supplice de Louis XVI et de Marie-Antoinette sous l'Empire et la Restauration 1812-1830*, Paris, 1981, pp. 160-162

action. While this was the traditional definition of tolerance, it had never actually been a Christian virtue, as the religious dogma excluded the very notion of religious tolerances.⁹⁷ While it is possible that the figure represents the concept of political tolerance, it is likely that the demurely seated figure, waiting, resigned and inactive, equally referred to Louis' capacity to endure and bear pain, hardship and injustice, a theme which would have reiterated the concept of martyrdom and sainthood.

Louis' last will and testament was paraded as a demonstration of his clemency and tolerance: 'I forgive with all my heart those who have made themselves my enemies...I do not reproach any of the crimes perpetrated against me.' This discourse of self-sacrifice and pardon was attributed to most of the family, as a document purported to be Marie-Antoinette's last letter to her sister Madame Elisabeth demonstrates: 'I forgive all my enemies the harm they have done to me.'⁹⁸ The original project for the 1815 Place de la Concorde monuments illustrated that idea with a cameo of the queen on the pedestal also inscribed with her words: 'I knew everything, saw everything and forgot all.'⁹⁹ However it was particularly in relation to Louis XVI that the Testament was paraded as proof of his sainthood, even being described by the *Moniteur* as being the very locus of his 'divine spirit'.¹⁰⁰ Christ, had

⁹⁷Pierre Larousse, *Dictionnaire universel*, vol. 15, 1876, p. 268

⁹⁸ Louis XVI: 'Je pardonne de tout mon coeur à ceux qui se sont faits mes ennemis...je ne reproche aucun des crimes qui sont avancés contre moi'. Marie-Antoinette: 'Je pardonne à tous mes ennemis le mal qu'ils m'ont fait.' *Testament de Louis XVI, Roi de France et de Navarre, et lettre de Marie-Antoinette d'Autriche, Reine de France et de Navarre à Madame Elisabeth*, Paris, 1817, pp. 8 and 16

⁹⁹'J'ai tout su, tout vu et tout oublié'. *Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

¹⁰⁰'...où est empreinte son âme divine'. *Moniteur Universel*, No. 363, 29 December, 1815

also pardoned his executioners and within these portrayals of Louis XVI the comparison was certainly implied if not overtly stated.

The image and text of the testament were paraded in many forms such as lavish printed publications, engravings and paintings. For example in 1817 the *Quotidienne* advertised an engraving by Dubois entitled *France transmits Louis XVI's testament to posterity* and in 1819 Battaglini (1787-?) exhibited a painting of *Louis XVI Writing his Testament* at the Salon (No. 42).¹⁰¹ The document also appeared, without exception, on all the monument projects in one form or another. The 1815 Place de la Concorde project described by Châteaubriand had the text of the testament inscribed on the pedestal.¹⁰² Later descriptions of the project indicated that the statue of Louis XVI would be holding his testament.¹⁰³ The descriptions of the Madeleine monument also indicate the figure of Louis, on his tomb, holding his testament.¹⁰⁴ Cortot's first 1826 design for the Place de la Concorde monument depicted the same idea (ill. 66), however the final version replaced the testament with the martyr's palm, a more readable, understandable symbol of the very same ideas the testament was meant to transmit (ill. 52). Cortot nonetheless included the testament as a scroll under the fallen crown at Louis' feet.

These strategies applied to the person of Louis XVI were also certainly intended to reflect on the current regime, as part of a process

¹⁰¹*La Quotidienne*, No. 21, 21 January, 1817

¹⁰²*Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January, 1815

¹⁰³*Moniteur Universel*, No. 363, 29 December, 1815

¹⁰⁴Fonds Grille 1271, Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers and *Eglise de la Madeleine, Monumens expiatoires, Idées générales sur l'exécution de la Loi d'Ordonnances du mois de janvier 1816*, Ministère de l'Intérieur, 29 January, 1816, Archives Nationales, F²¹ 582

of enhancing the image of the monarchy in general. The image of the virtuous ruler certainly was intended to counter the decadent, selfish, immoral image perpetuated by the Revolution and could be discerned in monuments dedicated to many of the Bourbons, such as Henri IV, best remembered for his wish to see every Frenchman have 'une poule au pot' and illustrated by the bronze bas-relief by François-Frédéric Lemot (1772-1827) on the Henri IV monument depicting the king distributing bread to the Parisian population. (ill. 75) Such use of the past as a reflection of the present was remarked upon by Châteaubriand, as he pointed out:

'Some will find in the testament of Louis XVI the origin and the confirmation of the article of the Charter that makes them safe from all prosecution. Others will contemplate memories, that having lost their bitterness with the passage of time, touch their soul with a religious tenderness.....Louis XVI's judge himself, could cross this square in the shadow of this merciful monument, perhaps not without remorse, but at least without fear.'¹⁰⁵

The testament of Louis XVI was wielded as proof of the mercy of the present regime and the more recent promise of pardon found in the Charter granted by Louis XVIII, which guaranteed safety from prosecution for the participants in the death of Louis XV.¹⁰⁶ This image of the Restoration, as forgiving and merciful seemed to work until the

¹⁰⁵'Les uns y trouveront dans le testament de Louis XVI l'origine et la confirmation de l'article de notre charte, qui les mets a l'abri de toutes recherches...Le juge de Louis XVI, à l'abri de ce monument de miséricorde, pourra lui-même traverser cette place, sinon sans remord, du moins sans crainte!' Châteaubriand, printed in the *Journal des débats*, 19 January 1815 and reprinted in the *Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, January 20, 1815.

¹⁰⁶The manner in which this strategy was adopted or opposed by historians has been discussed by Susan Dunn, *The Deaths of Louis XVI, Regicide and the French Political Imagination*, Princeton, 1994

aftermath of Napoleon's brief return but the executions in 1815 of Ney and Labédoyère, who had rallied to the Emperor's side, destroyed the plausibility of the rhetoric. Louis XVIII's decision to remove that rhetoric from the public space in 1816, by transferring the national expiatory monument to Louis XVI inside the Madeleine may have resulted from the realization of the contradictory nature of the two images of the monarchy: forgiving and punishing at once.

The various projects for monuments to Louis XVI contrasted both in their use of space and in the commemorative rhetoric they adopted with the very nature of commemoration established during the late Eighteenth Century. In combination with the Restoration's attempt to level that contrast by also altering the nature of the cemetery at Père Lachaise with the establishment of religious symbols and edifices such as Godde's entrance and chapel, this resulted in creating strongholds of dissent across the cemetery's landscape. Thanks to the relative freedom of expression afforded by the private status of the cemetery, it was possible for the space to become a politically engaged forum of expression and the attempt to create a religious focus at the cemetery was countered by the assertion of the civil, secular nature of the space by figures such as the actor Talma, discussed in the previous chapter. The reinstatement of a royal urban commemorative monopoly was countered by the numerous public subscriptions organized for the erection of monuments at Père Lachaise during the period, reiterating a democratic ideal of commemorating merit. The iconography of martyrdom and sainthood of the urban monuments was countered by these secular examples, but it is especially with the case of the monument to General Foy - a liberal opposition leader during the

Restoration, who died in 1825 - discussed in the following chapter, that the response was articulated in one of the clearest and strongest ways.

Chapter Four

Liberal Politics and the Parisian Cemetery: David d'Angers and Léon Vaudoyer's Monument to General Foy, 1825-1831

The tomb of General Foy in Père Lachaise was designed and constructed between 1826 and 1831, precisely the period when many of the urban commemorative projects dedicated to Louis XVI were in progress, or like the *Chapelle Expiatoire* complex, largely complete. (ills. 76 and 77) Charles X had just rededicated the Place de la Concorde to Louis XVI in 1826, and work at the Madeleine was nearing the point of starting on the sculptural decor. Foy's position as an outspoken liberal opposition leader imbued any monument to his memory with a potentially subversive anti-establishment character. At Père Lachaise however, the right of each individual to erect 'upon the grave of a parent or friend a sign or a stone, without the need for authorization' had been established early on.¹ Only the inscriptions had to be scrutinized and authorized by the Prefecture of the Seine. Spelling errors as well as slandering the government were unacceptable, but imagery remained largely unmonitored.² As a result, protected by the guise of privacy, and yet endowed with a high degree

¹Imperial Decree 23 Prairial, an XII, (June 1, 1804)

²Préfecture du Département de la seine, Cimetière de la ville de Paris, *Règlement Général*, Article 14: 'dans l'intérêt du bon ordre et des convenances publiques, aucune inscription, épitaphe, ne pourra être mise ou gravée sur une croix, pierre tumulaire ou monument, qu'après avoir été revêtue du visa exigé par l'arrêté du 1er Juin, 1817; à cet effet chaque inscription sera préalablement présenté à la Préfecture de la Seine. Fait à Paris le 10 Avril, 1827.' Signed Chabrol, Prefect of the Seine. Reproduced in N. Richard, *Le V véritable conducteur au Père Lachaise, Montrouge, Montparnasse et Vaugirard*, Paris, 1830, p. 22

of publicness in its popularity and visibility, Père Lachaise cemetery offered the ideal opportunity for a certain freedom of expression and the propagation of ideas that might otherwise be subject to censorship. The case of the Monument to General Foy, demonstrates a particularly bold use of this freedom. While art historians have recognized that there is indeed an expression of oppositional political beliefs in the monument, there has been little analysis of the particular syntax of that expression.³ An important, but neglected, aspect of the monument's oppositional expression is the iconographical discourse it engaged in with the ideology of public Bourbon propaganda monuments in the capital.

Maximilien Sebastien Foy's adherence to the principles of liberty had almost cost him his military career when he refused to vote for the conferment of imperial sovereignty upon Napoleon. However, having distinguished himself at Austerlitz and Constantinople, he finally earned his general's rank in Spain. After the Restoration, Foy left the military and embarked upon a political career, and in 1819 he was elected to the Chamber of Deputies. Until his death on November 28, 1825, he remained the leader of the liberal opposition and one of the most brilliant orators of his day. His funeral procession was one of the most memorable events of the period, winding its way through the streets of the city to the cemetery, with over 100,000 mourners reputedly making the seven hour journey on foot. The impressive and symbolic nature of the event remained a vivid image for many years,

³For example Antoinette Le Normand-Romain's article 'Le Monument du Général Foy au Père-Lachaise', deals mostly with the aesthetic evolution of the monument and less with an interpretation of the iconography in its social and political context. *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de l'art français*, 1992

reproduced in newspaper accounts, journals and popular engravings by the score. A public subscription was opened for the funding of a monument and to create a pension for his wife and family. The subscription was immediately successful, raising staggering sums in only a matter of days: 127, 000 francs by the 1st of December and 615, 631 francs by the end of the month.⁴ In all over one million francs were raised.⁵

A large outpouring of Foy imagery flooded the market in the wake of his death, proliferating seemingly unchecked and uncensored. A visiting American, N. H.. Carter described the atmosphere:

'The day after the funeral, portraits, prints and biographical sketches of General Foy, as well as the elegiac effusions of the Gallic Muse, were for sale at all the shops in Paris. The papers were filled with eulogies; pocket handkerchiefs were struck off, bearing the likeness of the deceased, and in short, his name met you at every turn in the streets.'⁶

Even perfume was named after Foy, such as the *Parfum législatif*, *Esprit du Général Foy*, whose label included a bust of Foy crowned by Glory.⁷ (ill. 78) The commemorative commerce extended into the realm of fine art as well with the widespread availability of medals commemorating Foy, like those sold in Paris by François Augustin

⁴See *Moniteur Universel*, No, 337, 3 December, 1825 and *Le Constitutionnel*, 3 January, 1826

⁵Jacques de Caso, *David d'Angers: L'Avenir de la mémoire, Étude sur l'art signalétique à l'époque romantique*, Paris, 1988, p. 111. The largest donations came from the banking community: Jacques Laffitte donated 50,000 francs, Casimir Périer donated 20,000 francs and Benjamin Delessert donated 10,000 francs.

⁶N. H. , *Letters from Europe, Comprising the Journal of a Tour Through Ireland, England, Scotland, France, Italy and Switzerland in the Years 1825, 1826 and 1827*, 2 vols., New York, 1827, vol. 1, p. 327

⁷Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Département des Estampes, Qb1 (1824-1830)

Caunois (1787-1859), ranging from 3 to 6 francs in price.⁸ Small bronze statuettes were produced by the studio of Horace Vernet, with features based on a mask taken after the general's death. The statuette depicted Foy, in uniform, standing on the legislative platform, symbolizing the dual aspects of his career. Only 15 inches high and on a small pedestal, the statuettes were ideal small purchases for domestic decoration. The studio also produced busts of the general.⁹ Many of these highly commercial productions were being well advertised in the press, but the Salon also displayed its fair share of Foy memorabilia. In 1827 François Dumont (1751-1831) exhibited a pair of canvases illustrating deliberations in the Chamber of Peers and the Chamber of Deputies, the latter giving Foy a prominent position. Both Jean-Jacques Flatters (1786-1845) and Théophile Bra (1797-1863) exhibited busts of the general that year as well. While financial considerations were certainly involved in the production and dissemination of these images, they were nonetheless also the product of a certain political engagement on the part of both producers and purchasers. As Carter declared, the republican cause was strengthened 'in the guise of honours to his [Foy's] memory'.¹⁰

Their renewed proliferation in the wake of the 1830 revolution confirms their liberal political associations, as paintings, sculpture and engravings of the general were prominent again at the Salon of 1831, including a plaster model of a statue by Caunois, Charles Brocas' (1774-1835) painting of the *Last Moments of the General*, an engraving of baron Gérard's portrait of the general by Johannot and even a *Portrait*

⁸*Le Constitutionnel*, 7 January, 1826

⁹*Le Constitutionnel*, 7 January, 1826

¹⁰N. H. Carter, *Letters from Europe*, vol. 1, New York, 1827, p.327

of *Madame Foy* by Saint-Omer. A concurrent exhibition was held in the Chamber of Peers to raise proceeds for the wounded of the 27, 28 and 29 July, 1830. The celebratory and ideological focus of that exhibition made the prominence of Foy imagery there even more significant. The two paintings by François Dumont depicting the Peers and the Deputies, previously exhibited at the Salon of 1827 were there, but most importantly, Paul Carpentier (1787-1877) exhibited a painting representing General Foy's funeral procession.¹¹ The tomb, on a larger more permanent scale, belongs within this politicized process of image production.

In 1826 the architect Léon Vaudoyer won the public competition organized for the design of Foy's tomb. The sculptor, David d'Angers, on the other hand, was chosen by the commissioners. At the time, Léon Vaudoyer, son of the architect A.L.T. Vaudoyer, was virtually unknown, having only won the Grand Prix de Rome competition after the Foy contest.¹² David d'Angers was a well established artist, having received a number of important public commissions under the Restoration, such as that for the colossal statue of the *Grand Condé* (ill. 79), one of a series for the Pont Louis XVI, today's Pont de la Concorde, the *Monument to Bonchamps* (ill. 80), a heroic victim of the counter-revolutionary struggle, for the Church of Saint-Florent-le Vell, and the *Monument to Archbishop Fénelon* (ill. 81), who died in 1715, for Cambrai cathedral. David d'Angers' personal political beliefs were however decidedly liberal, if not yet as staunchly republican as they

¹¹See Pierre Larousse, 'Foy', *Dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle*, vols 1-17, Paris, 1864-1886, vol. 8, 1872, p.689

¹²See Barry Bergdoll, *Léon Vaudoyer, Historicism in the Age of Industry*, Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1994, p.41

were to be later in his life, and were expressed in works such as the marble exhibited at the Salon of 1827, depicting a *Young Greek Girl at the Tomb of Marco Botzaris* (ill. 82), a leader in the Greek struggle for Independence against the Turks, which was perhaps the most fashionable liberal cause of the 1820's. David's fame and recognized liberal sympathies may have made him the obvious choice for the commission, but they also led to the overshadowing of Vaudoyer's contribution.

While the role of sculpture is significant, the monument's form is decidedly architectural. (ills. 76 and 77) A solid square base is surmounted at a slightly higher level, by a surrounding strip of bas-reliefs, and the whole is topped by a templetto sheltering a free-standing statue of the general enveloped in classical robes, his arm raised in the eloquent gesture of oration. At the front of the monument ~~are~~ Geniuses representing Eloquence and War placed on either side of the inscription, an allegorical reference to the dual nature of Foy's career and a theme also elaborated in the bas-reliefs. A battle scene commemorates his military career, and in particular his part in the Spanish war under Napoleon. In another bas-relief, Foy is depicted as the political leader in the midst of a speech in the Chamber of Deputies. The third and final bas-relief depicts the momentous funeral procession.

In earlier commemorative projects David had placed bas-reliefs with scenes from the life of the commemorated beneath their statues. The *Monument to Fénelon* (1822-27, ill. 81) is a case in point, where the reclining figure of the bishop surmounts three small reliefs depicting scenes celebrating his charitable deeds and role in educating

the Duc de Bourgogne. The same composition is repeated in the *Monument to General Gobert* (1847, ill. 83), with its three heroic battle scenes completed by a life-size equestrian group of the general succumbing in the midst of battle. In his writings David similarly emphasized the important role played by the bas-relief:

'In writing the life of a famous man, one relegates the circumstances of his private life to the notes. That is how the sculptor works. The bas-reliefs at the foot of the statue are as the explanatory notes at the end of a book.'¹³

This has led some art historians to see this marriage of monumental effigy and historical reliefs as a trademark of the sculptor, imposed by him upon the Foy monument.¹⁴ One of Foy's biographers went so far as to write that Vaudoyer's contribution was limited to David's 'entrusting' him with the architectural aspects of the tomb.¹⁵ David's inflated sense of his own worth was partially responsible for this view, expressed in his own words on the matter, as recorded by Henri Jouin, namely that 'all the projects had been rejected as unworthy. It is then that the commission chose me unanimously, I who had not taken part in the struggle!'¹⁶ As a result, David has largely

¹³'Celui qui écrit la vie d'un homme célèbre relègue dans les notes de l'ouvrage les circonstances de sa vie intime. Ainsi ferait le sculpteur. Les bas-reliefs sont aux pieds de la statue comme les notes explicatives aux pieds d'un livre.' Cited by AnotINETTE Le Normand-Romain, 'Des archives impérissables: les monuments publics et funéraires', *Aux grands hommes, David d'Angers*, Fondation de Coubertin, 1990, p. 50

¹⁴'Très tôt ...David prend l'habitude de compléter la statue par des reliefs historiés...Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, 'Des archives impérissables...', 1990, p.50

¹⁵Victor Bompar, *Le Général Foy, sa gloire militaire, sa gloire parlementaire, sa gloire posthume*, Paris, 1925, p. 300

¹⁶'...tous les projets avaient été rejetés comme indignes, c'est alors que la commission me choisit à l'unanimité, moi qui n'avait pas pris part à la lutte!' in

been given the credit for the main features of the monument and his personal aesthetic and political beliefs have been cited at length to bolster this view. However, David was not unique in his views and the principles visible in the monument were part of more pervasive political and aesthetic discourses. To begin with it was Vaudoyer who was responsible for the general composition of the monument, as set out in his winning proposal to the 1826 competition. Moreover, the subject of the reliefs may have been largely pre-determined by the architect prior to his partnership with the sculptor as at least one of the bas-relief subjects, the funeral procession, which was perhaps the most innovative aspect of the monument, was part of Vaudoyer's initial proposal.¹⁷ Therefore, while David's influence was certainly considerable, the monument cannot be perceived as simply a typical product of his identifiable working practices or aesthetic ideas, for Vaudoyer's artistic contribution seems to have been more considerable than has hitherto been acknowledged. Furthermore, as this paper will seek to demonstrate, the liberal beliefs shared by the commissioners and subscribers of the monument, the iconography of other public works and popular imagery were equally responsible for influencing the final design.

Foy's military career is illustrated by a bas-relief entitled 'Foy in Spain'. (ill. 84) The specificity of the military scene jars with the

Henri Jouin, *David d'Angers, sa vie, son oeuvre, ses écrits et ses contemporains*, 2 vols., Paris, 1878, vol. 1, p. 184

¹⁷'Bulletin des Arts-Concours pour le monument à élever en l'honneur du général Foy', *Le Globe*, vol. III, No. 48, 13 April 1826

Vaudoyer's model was not definitive and changes were certainly made. A letter from Brady, secretary of the monument commission, to David requires his presence at a meeting whose principal object was to discuss modifications to Vaudoyer's projects. Brady to David, 11 May, 1826. Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers, Ms. 1873

generality of its political counterpart, a scene in the Chamber of Deputies which does not seem to refer to any particular event, such as an especially memorable speech, for example. Some of Foy's most memorable military achievements under Napoleon had taken place in Spain and it is possible that the relief refers to one particular event illustrated in several versions of a popular print entitled *Trait de bravoure du Général Foy*. (ill. 85) The scene depicts an incident in Spain when Foy was leading a group of frightened conscripts.¹⁸ When their path was blocked by the enemy, Foy charged first, inciting his troops to follow, by crying: 'Forward my friends, follow me, bullets do not hurt!' Foy does seem to be leading his troops forward in David's bas-relief, but the troops behind him seem to be seasoned, whiskered *poilus* rather than the nervous young conscripts of the prints, therefore it is not possible to correlate the two scenes with any certainty. Moreover, the Spanish campaign had been relatively obscured by the more spectacular events of the Napoleonic period in Russia, Poland and even Germany, and Foy's campaign in Spain did not even necessarily feature prominently in the collective memory.

As contemporary engravings of the temporary headstone erected over Foy's grave show, the tomb was surrounded by an enclosure with plaques at each of its four corners celebrating some of Foy's military accomplishments.¹⁹ (ill. 86) Foy's most memorable battles were displayed on these plaques as 'Jemmapes 1792', 'Passage du Rhin

¹⁸See Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Estampes, Portraits, N2 fol., Foy, Microfilm D143755

¹⁹An engraving of the tomb by A. Blondeau is reproduced in Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire du curieux dans le cimetière du Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1828. Another engraving by A. Marcellin can be found in the Cabinet des estampes, Bibliothèque nationale de Paris.

1796', 'Zurich 1799' and 'Waterloo 1815', with no reference to Spain at all.²⁰ David himself had at one time considered portraying a different campaign for the military bas-relief: 'I am working on General Foy's monument...four bas-reliefs, 10 feet long. The first represents the general's funeral procession, the second the general at the tribune of the Legislative assembly the third, the battle of Waterloo.'²¹ David himself made a pilgrimage to the battlefield at Waterloo in 1825, from which he brought back an old cross which he referred to as a 'precious relic from venerated ground, for the blood spilled there by the brave sanctified it'.²² David's personal experience and feelings may have therefore initially pushed him towards depicting the battle of Waterloo on the bas-relief. Yet, while Foy's military career before the first Restoration might be assimilated into the greater glory of France, even within the confines of the cemetery, the glorification of Foy's role at Waterloo represented a more obvious critique of the current regime. The Bourbon attitude towards allegiance to Napoleon during the hundred days, and hence Waterloo, was less understanding and some participants had been subject to exile, like Saint-Jean d'Angély, and even, like Marshal Ney, to execution. As a result of these tensions, one might at first be led to believe that the choice of Spain was a means of tempering the provocative nature of the bas-relief. However, in comparison to Waterloo, recent events actually made the topic of Spain even more relevant as a comment on the current political situation.

²⁰See description of the tomb by Richard, 1830, p. 153

²¹'Je m'occupe du monument du général Foy...quatre bas-reliefs de 10 pieds de long. Le premier représente le convoi du général, le second le général à la tribune législative, le troisième, la bataille de Waterloo...'. David d'Angers, Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers, Ms. 1872

²²'...cette précieuse rélique d'une terre vénéré, car le sang des braves sanctifie le lieu arrosé par eux...' David d'Angers, Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers, Ms. 1873

A failed absolutist coup in Spain in 1822 had resulted in the capture of the king by liberal opposition forces.²³ In 1823 France, despite much criticism from the liberals, sent forces to intervene on behalf of the Spanish King. Divisions were led by the Marquis de Lauriston, Molitor, General Bourcke and the Duc d'Angoulême. The campaign was a success, and the Bourbons had a military victory to tout in the face of Napoleonic legend.²⁴ As the eldest son of the future Charles X, and eventual heir to the throne, the Duc d'Angoulême's participation was of great importance as the direct embodiment of Bourbon military prowess and as a reflection of this, the figure of the duke alone largely came to symbolize the victory in general. The liberal opposition in France demonstrated passionately against the intervention in Spain. Liberal supporters even formed a battalion of French volunteers which went to Spain to fight on the side of the constitutionalists and they gathered under the proscribed flags of Jemmapes and Austerlitz.²⁵ Deputy Jacques-Antoine Manuel's virulent tirade against French legitimist intervention led to his expulsion and exclusion from the Chamber. He was followed by the whole of the liberal opposition, who did not return until the next session.²⁶ This period subsequently marked the decline of the opposition and the resurgence of a right wing majority. The scene of Foy in Spain not only referred to the liberal opposition over the Spanish campaign, but also represented a challenge to the Bourbon military achievement.

²³G. de Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, Paris, 1955, p. 185

²⁴Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, pp. 190-192

²⁵Larousse, *Dictionnaire universel*, Paris, vol. 3, 1867, p.447

²⁶ Bertier de Sauvigny *La Restauration*, p. 189

The Duc d'Angoulême's victory was a small skirmish in comparison to the scale of the Napoleonic campaigns but the Bourbons were determined to overshadow their rival's military glory. Their self-glorification was all the more bitter to the veterans of the Napoleonic campaigns, neglected and dismissed in large numbers without appropriate pensions by the Restoration regime.²⁷ Even Châteaubriand, a royalist supporter recognized that this had been one of the Restoration regime's greatest mistakes: 'From the beginning, the Restoration made an irreparable mistake: it should have dismissed the military all the while conserving the marshals, the generals, the military governors, the officers, with their pensions, honors and rank; the soldiers would have subsequently re-entered the reconstituted army...the legitimate regime would not have had against it, from the outset, these soldiers of the Empire, organized, assembled and designated as they were in their victorious days, constantly reminiscing about the old days amongst themselves, feeding their regrets and their hostile feelings towards their new master...'²⁸ Foy had personally championed their cause to the very end, and their gratitude was recorded on his monument by the inclusion of an unidentifiable soldier, with his empty sleeve, to the very right of the funeral procession. Châteaubriand also recognized that there was an affront to these

²⁷Bertier de Sauvigny *La Restauration*, pp. 78-9

²⁸'La Restauration à son début, commit une faute irréparable: elle devait licencier l'armée en conservant les maréchaux, les généraux, les gouverneurs militaires, les officiers dans leurs pensions, honneurs et grades; les soldats seraient rentrés ensuite successivement dans l'armée reconstituée...la légitimité n'eût pas eu d'abord contre elle ces soldats de l'Empire organisés, embrigadés, dénommés comme ils l'étaient aux jours de leurs victoires, sans cesse causant entre eux du temps passé, nourrissant des regrets et des sentiments hostiles à leur nouveau maître...' Châteaubriand, *Mémoire d'outre-tombe*, vols. 1-12, 1849-1850, vols. 1-2, Paris, Flammarion edition 1951, vol. 1, Book 22, Chapter 21, p. 896

veterans implicit in the glorification of the recent Spanish campaign: 'it is not...to the men of the battlefields of Marengo, Austerlitz and Jena that one must boast of the encounters of the Duc d'Angoulême in the peninsula.'²⁹

The bas-relief of Foy in Spain represented a liberal re-appropriation of military achievement and glory, a reaffirmation of forgotten Napoleonic veterans, of their achievements and indeed existence. It is perhaps for this reason that David chose to portray General Foy in action. A preliminary sketch for the bas-relief does show a more sedate image of Foy's military career, with the general standing in the centre and balanced on either side by groups of soldiers, a composition similar to that of the scene in the Chamber.³⁰ David however chose to abandon the harmony between the two bas-reliefs in order to emphasize an active battle scene. Foy is depicted right there in the midst of his troops, perpetuating the legendary bravura of the Napoleonic military leaders, whose prowess was based on real battle skills rather than inherited rank. It was becoming even more important to create permanent, publicly visible reminders of this as Bourbon propaganda was setting in motion a scheme to literally superimpose their recent victory over those of the past.

Lauriston, as Minister of the Maison du Roi commissioned a painting from Gros depicting the Taking of the Trocadero in Spain, specifying a 'painting of the same dimensions as that of his *Pesthouse*

²⁹'...ce n'est point aux hommes des champs de Marengo, d'Austerlitz et d'Iéna qu'il faut vanter les rencontres du duc d'Angoulême dans la péninsule.' Quoted in Gérard Hubert, 'L'Art français au service de la Restauration, À propos des épaves de l'arc du Carroussel conservés au Louvre', *La Revue des arts*, V, December 1955, p 209

³⁰Drawing in the Musée David d'Angers, Inventory number 364 I 23d.

at Jaffa, painted for Napoleon in 1804, measuring 17' 5 and 1/2 by 23' 7 and 1/2.³¹ Furthermore, plans were made for the appropriation of sites and monuments once destined for the glorification of Napoleonic victories. A project for completing the arch at the Étoile replaced Napoleonic victory for a Bourbon one. This project remained largely at the conceptual stage, but transformation of the arc du Carroussel was almost realized. The arch in front of the Louvre had once been decorated with bas-reliefs commemorating the campaign of Austerlitz and surmounted by the Horses of Saint Mark. The Allies had stripped the monument in 1815, and it had since remained in this mutilated state. Six bas-reliefs commemorating the new Spanish campaign were ordered between 1823-25 and David received the commission for one of these bas-reliefs, depicting Louis XVIII receiving the Duc d'Angoulême upon his return from Spain.³² (ill. 87) David was further occupied with the glorification of the Duc d'Angoulême in Spain as he, along with Claude Ramey (1754- 1838), was preparing bas-reliefs for a triumphal arch in Marseilles.³³

David had actually been working on the bas-relief for the Carroussel since April 1825³⁴, some months before Foy's death, but the link between the two campaigns had already been made by other artists. In 1824 and 1827 the Bourbon victory was well represented at

³¹Quoted in Hubert, *L'Art français...*, *La Revue des arts*, pp. 210-212

³²For commission see Hubert, *L'Art français...*, *La Revue des arts*, p. 214. David's notebook, dated 12 March, 1827, reads: 'I am occupied with a large bas-relief for the arch of the Carroussel, the subject is the return of the Duc d'Angoulême...', 'Je m'occupe d'un grand bas-relief pour l'arc du Carroussel, le sujet est le retour du Duc d'Angoulême...', Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers, Ms. 1872

³³Drawings for three bas-reliefs were completed just months before the July revolution. J. de Caso, *David d'Angers*, p. 123

³⁴Commissions had been given 9 April, 1825. Hubert, 'L'Art Français...', *La Revue des arts*, p. 214

the Salon, with a number of artists also taking the opportunity to recall the 1809-1813 Spanish campaign.³⁵ Paintings of the capture of the Trocadero by Abel de Pujol, Adam, Delaroche and d'Hardevillier hung besides Langlois' depiction of Maréchal Mortier's victory at Arzobispo in 1809 and Lejeune's of the French victory at Chiclana in 1811 over Anglo-Spanish forces. Some of the Carroussel bas-reliefs, including David d'Anger's, were also exhibited at the 1827 Salon and David may have been prompted to alter his choice of subject for the Foy bas-relief in the face of the clearly subversive dialogue visible at the exhibition. Plaster models of the bas-reliefs commemorating the Spanish campaign were placed on the arch in 1828 but the July Revolution interrupted the completion of the marbles, and the plaster models were removed in 1831. Had the Angoulême project remained on the Carroussel arch, it would have served as a dialectical opposition to the Foy bas-relief: the one in triumph on the arch before the royal Louvre palace, the other in the more liberal, democratic space of Père Lachaise cemetery.

The depiction of Foy in the Chamber of Deputies seems in itself an obvious and unproblematic choice, as an illustration of the political career. Some contestants for the tomb had chosen this aspect of the general's career above all others and proposed monuments in the form of empty rostrums, a format that may have given David the idea for the tomb he designed for Étienne-Joseph-Louis Garnier-Pagès, who like Foy, was active in the liberal opposition during the Bourbon Restoration and continued to oppose the Orleans Regime until his death in 1841.³⁶ The tomb, an empty rostrum of white marble with a granite base,

³⁵Hubert, *L'Art français...*, *La Revue des arts*, p. 214

³⁶*Bulletin des arts...*, *Le Globe*, No. 48, 13 April 1826

surmounting a black marble casket, the whole decorated only with a laurel wreath, denoting civic achievement and a list of the orator's most famous speeches (ill. 88), was complete in 1843 when it was reviewed and engraved in *L'Illustration*.³⁷ It was described as being quite original in style, and while no precedents were mentioned, it is highly likely that David's design had its source in the rejected proposals for Foy's tomb. The rhetoric surrounding Garnier-Pagès' death seems oddly similar to that surrounding Foy's in 1825, also serving to gather opposition elements at the funeral, for example, and David may have been reminded of the earlier project.

David's bas-relief representing Foy's political career does more though than simply commemorate a political career, but seems to refer to its particularly liberal bias, by representing the general in the Chamber surrounded by a crowd of largely identifiable figures in contemporary costume, who seem to be for the most part, largely liberal, like-minded politicians.³⁸ (ill. 89) In and of itself, this representation of Foy's recognized position as a leader of the liberal faction would not be seditious, but was a mere statement of fact. The bas-relief is not however, strictly speaking accurate or historical. It is not a re-enactment of a session in the Chamber of Deputies with Foy delivering one of the eloquent speeches for which he was famous. The Deputies would not have been standing in the Chamber, or necessarily

³⁷*L'Illustration*, No. 19, 8 July, 1843

³⁸An engraving of the monument by Leroux published in 1831 included a key identifying the figures from left to right as follows: Daunou, Chauvelin, Châteaubriand, J. Lafitte, Alexandre de Lameth, Royer-Collard, Camille Jordan, Kératry, Dupin aîné, General Gérard, Abbé de Pradt, Foy himself, Caumartin, Casimir Perrier, Manuel, Lafayette, Ternaux, Étienne, Labbey de Pompières, Benjamin Constant, Guizot and Bodin. A copy of the engraving can be found in the Département des estampes, Bibliothèque nationale de Paris.

wearing their robes, as they are depicted in the bas-relief, and moreover, the individuals gathered here did not all sit in the Chamber at the same time.³⁹ Châteaubriand is clearly identifiable, third from the left, with his distinctive profile and wild, romantic hairstyle and his presence seems at first at odds with the idea that this might be a symbolic representation of an ideal liberal Chamber, as he is remembered principally as a supporter of royalist politics. These politics were somewhat tempered by a belief in individual liberties, visible in works such as the pamphlet *The Monarchy According to the Charter* (1816), where he declared his ideas that the nation be ruled by the monarch but governed in part by an elected body of representatives. However, this moderated monarchism would probably not have been sufficient to include him among the liberal ranks.

The events of 1824, and Châteaubriand's shabby treatment by the conservative majority government may have helped to earn him this position. Early in 1824 Châteaubriand became Minister of Foreign Affairs and it was during this period that another right wing dominated Chamber was elected, bringing with it a number of demands such as a bill to reduce the high yield of State Bonds so that the money saved by the government could be used to indemnify the émigrés for their losses. Châteaubriand had voted against the bill, which scraped by nonetheless and in punishment, he was dismissed from his post, 'like a lackey', he wrote, 'as if I [he] had stolen the king's watch off the mantelpiece'.⁴⁰ It was at this period that he took on an oppositional

³⁹For example, Dupin, aîné did not become a Deputy until 1826, and Abbé de Pradt until 1827. By this time other members such as Bodin were no longer Deputies.

⁴⁰See Charles Ledré, *La Presse à l'assaut de la monarchie 1815-1848*; Paris, 1960, p. 27

stance, though without relinquishing his belief in the monarchy. David had long admired Châteaubriand and his writings and this may have induced him to include the writer, but Foy's death coincided with the victory for the émigrés over the State Bonds, and Châteaubriand's presence on the bas-relief is most likely a reference to these events. David had stated that '...on General Foy's bas-reliefs, I will depict the features of the men who sustain with their energy the interests of the nation...'⁴¹ Châteaubriand had acted against the wishes of the royalist conservative party in order to represent the best interests of the nation, even if this temporarily allied him with the desires of the liberals. The incorporation of Châteaubriand amongst this group of recognized liberals in the Chamber of Deputies called to mind these recent events and was therefore much more provocative than a forthright liberal gathering. The liberal appropriation of an important figure like Châteaubriand, one of the most eloquent, intelligent, respected and convincing upholders of monarchy, was a far greater threat to the regime than any gathering of already recognized liberal leaders and served as a metaphor for a growing opposition.

The bas-relief of the funeral procession seems a most unusual subject, yet in the context of the events following Foy's death, it seemed almost as important as any of the events of his life. Many of Foy's biographers devoted almost as much importance to the description of his funeral as to his military and civic achievements. The event was immortalized in paintings such as Paul Carpentier's

⁴¹'...dans les bas-reliefs du général Foy, je représenterai les traits des hommes qui soutiennent avec leur énergie les intérêts de la nation...', David d'Angers, cited in *Galerie David d'Angers*, Angers, 1989, p. 46

mentioned above and popularized by numerous prints.⁴² (ill. 90) The *Globe's* critic in reviewing the 1827 contest for the tomb, not only cited Vaudoyer's idea as highly innovative and imaginative, but was surprised that 'only one of the contestants had thought of the idea of representing the scene of the procession in a bas-relief.'⁴³ There is little doubt that the event itself was intended by its participants and interpreted by the regime as much more than a private demonstration of mourning and personal loss. In preparation for Foy's funeral, the barracks of the Faubourg Saint-Germain were ready to stand to arms at the first signal and agents were placed along the procession route, even mixing in with the mourners and making note of their names.⁴⁴ David d'Anger's own account of the procession certainly implies an atmosphere of political protest: '...each individual demonstrated by this action their opposition to the government...'⁴⁵ The funeral was certainly opportunity for a liberal demonstration without fear of retribution. In a period when newspapers and gatherings might be censored or banned, here was a chance to make a political statement by the sheer numbers attending the event, a statement particularly important in November of 1825, as the last Chamber elected in 1824 for a seven-year term had been overwhelmingly conservative. Only 19 members of the liberal opposition out of 430 deputies had managed to

⁴²For example, for an engraving of the funeral see Bibliothèque Nationale, Estampes, QB1 1825-1831

⁴³'Ce qui étonne c'est que l'idée de représenter en bas-relief la scène du convoi funèbre ne soit venue qu'à un seul concurrent...La manière dont il l'a conçue et esquissée lui fait beaucoup d'honneur.', 'Bulletin des Arts...', *Le Globe*, No. 48, 13 April 1826

⁴⁴Tissot, *Notice sur la vie du général Foy*, Paris, 1826, p. 256 and Froment, *La Police dévoilée*, 3 vols., Paris, 1829, vol. 3, pp. 51-54

⁴⁵'...chaque particulier luttait par cette action contre le gouvernement...', *Les Carnets de David d'Angers*, A Bruel ed., 2 vols., Paris, 1958, vol. 1, p. 110

gain a seat.⁴⁶ The outpouring of public sentiment at Foy's funeral was a statement that recent events had not diminished liberal strength and determination, and indeed the liberals claimed: 'The loss of a great man has strengthened our bond.'⁴⁷ The success of this moral boosting manifestation was made evident by the subsequent improvement in the liberal position and their eventual triumph in 1830.

The recognition of the funeral as a liberal oppositional statement has led historians to assume that all those assembled around the coffin in David's bas-relief shared Foy's convictions.⁴⁸ (ill. 91) As in the Chamber, the costumes are contemporary and the features of most of the individuals are recognizable and one does find a large number of liberal supporters, but not an exclusive grouping of opposition members.⁴⁹ Victor Hugo occupies a prominent position, as one of the young men (central figure) carrying the coffin, yet in the 1820s his sympathies were royalist. In 1819 he had been awarded prizes for two ardently royalist odes, from 1819 to 1821 he published the royalist *Conservateur littéraire* and in 1825 he received a commission for an

⁴⁶André Jardin and André Tudesque, *Restoration and Reaction, 1815-1848*, Cambridge, 1983, p. 57

⁴⁷*Journée du 30 novembre, 1825, ou récit des derniers moments du Général Foy*, Vendue au profit de la souscription, Paris, 1825, p. 8

⁴⁸'...il [David] rassemble autour du cercueil tous ceux qui partagèrent les convictions de Foy pour en faire un véritable manifeste de l'opposition libérale...', Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, 'Le Monument du Général Foy...', *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de l'art français*, p. 189

⁴⁹For identification, see Leroux' engraving, cited above. From the left are Viennet, Gohier, Alexandre Lameth, Casimir Perrier, Benjamin Constant, the Duc de Choiseul, Jourdan, Delphine Gay, the General's nephew holding one of the Foy children, another nephew, Charlet, Kératry and Foy's two other children below. Carrying the coffin, in the center is Victor Hugo, then Mérimée, David himself, Brady, Dupin aîné, an unidentifiable soldier, Prud'homme and the Colonel Fabvier. Unidentifiable mourners finish off the scene.

ode for the coronation of Charles X.⁵⁰ Neither is the bas-relief purely a biographical narrative or a re-enactment of the event. There is no evidence to indicate Hugo's presence and none of the accounts of the funeral mention him and Henri Jouin also tells us that Colonel Fabvier was absent, as he was in Athens at the time.⁵¹

As Jacques de Caso, a leading scholar on David, has written:

'What ultimately matters in this relief is less the illustration of an event, the historical, circumstantial truth that sculpture would preserve this document, than its metaphorical expression, the attachment to a liberal way of thinking...'

He continues however by claiming that this expression, this way of thinking

'...is not exclusively political and ... expresses a character, that is after all moderate; the undertaking of the subscription and of the erection of the monument was supported by big business; it was certainly liberal in spirit, but was not understood to be a direct provocation to the regime.'⁵²

A symbolic reading does not, however, need to displace a politically oppositional message. It is true that there is no indication that any attempt was made to censor or alter the imagery, but then, the monument was not unveiled until after the displacement of the

⁵⁰Gustave Simon, 'Introduction', in Léopold-Lacour ed., *Victor Hugo, Oeuvres choisies illustrées, Poésie*, Paris, n.d., pp. 10-11

⁵¹Jouin, *David d'Angers*, p. 164-5

⁵²'Ce qui comte en définitive dans ce relief est moins l'illustration d'un évènement, une vérité historique, circonstancielle, que la sculpture préserverait comme un document, que son expression métaphorique, l'attachement de milieux divers à une pensée libérale qui n'est pas exclusivement politique et qui exprime un caractère, après tout modéré; l'entreprise de la souscription et de l'erection du monument fut patronnée par la haute finance; elle fut certes d'esprit libéral, mais ne fut pas comprise comme une provocation adressé au régime.', J. de Caso, *David d'Angers*, p. 120

Bourbon monarchy. The representation of only recognizable liberal party members on the bas-relief would simply have confirmed a known quantity. Instead, a heterogeneous group that defies political categorization brings forth the notion that Foy's commemoration transcended party politics, an idea promulgated by the liberal opposition in order to strengthen the general's image as a great leader.

On January 1, 1826 the liberal *Constitutionnel*, one of the most important newspapers of the period, wrote:

'History has proved, again and again, that it was more often, particular events that revealed the veritable nature of the public spirit of different populations in antiquity...One of these great events has just taken place amongst us. The capital, by a spontaneous movement that force could not control, revealed the feeling of a great loss...Not only do all the citizens of Paris seem to have lost someone dear to them, but the factional spirit has disappeared; praise for General Foy is on everyone's lips...'⁵³

A pamphlet recounting the events of the 30 November, published and sold for the benefit of the subscription, promoted the notion that citizens of all ages, sex, rank and opinion, 'all those who carried a French heart', rallied around the general's remains.⁵⁴ The memory of it, and the rhetoric of national unity remained for many decades as in

⁵³L'histoire a prouvé, en maintes circonstances, que ce sont le plus souvent, des événements particuliers qui ont révélée la situation véritable de l'esprit public chez les différents peuples dans l'antiquité...Un de ces grands événements vient d'avoir lieu parmi nous. La capitale par un mouvement spontané que la force ne saurait commander, a révélé le sentiment d'une perte immense...Non seulement les citoyens de Paris semblaient tous avoir perdu un de leur proches, mais l'esprit de parti avait disparu; l'éloge du général Foy était dans toutes les bouches...'Le *Constitutionnel, Journal du commerce, politique et littéraire*, 1 January, 1826

⁵⁴*Journée du 30 novembre*, pp. 8 and 69-70

1853, when Villemain recalled the spectacle, as a 'national' funeral.⁵⁵
 In 1872 as well, the *Dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle* still wrote of Foy's death as engendering a 'period of public mourning'.⁵⁶

The only female presence on the bas-relief of the procession, little more than a head visible in the crowd behind the coffin, is partially explained by this, as she is not the grieving wife, but Delphine Gay, a young poetess. The absence of Madame Foy is explained by protocol, which dictated that husbands or wives did not follow the funeral processions of their spouses, but the presence of Mlle. Gay was likewise unconventional, as it did not become acceptable for women to join the men in funeral processions until mid-century.⁵⁷ However, Delphine Gay's poetic eulogy to Foy had moved the nation, made her a household name overnight, and earned her the nickname 'Muse of the Nation'. On the day of the funeral she read those lines over his grave.⁵⁸

⁵⁵Villemain, 'Souvenirs de la Sorbonne en 1825, Démosthène et le Général Foy', *Revue des deux mondes*, January 1853, p. 75

⁵⁶Pierre Larousse, 'Foy', *Dictionnaire universel*, p. 689

⁵⁷Pierre Larousse, 'Funérailles', *Dictionnaire universel*, vol. 8, Paris, 1872, p. 879

⁵⁸*Stances sur la mort du Général Foy*

Pleurez, Français, Pleurez! la patrie est en deuil;
 Pleurez le défenseur que la mort vous enlève;
 Et vous, nobles guerriers, sur son muet cerceuil
 Disputez-vous l'honneur de déposer son glaive!
 Vous ne l'entendrez plus, l'orateur redouté
 Dont l'injure jamais ne souilla l'éloquence;
 Celui qui, de nos rois respectant la puissance,
 En fidèle sujet parla de liberté:
 Le Ciel, lui décernant la sainte récompense,
 A commencé trop tôt son immortalité!
 Son bras libérateur dans la tombe est esclave;
 Son front pur s'est glacé sous le laurier vainqueur
 Et ce signe sacré, cette étoile du brave,
 Ne sent plus palpiter son cœur.
 Hier quand de ses jours la source fut tarie,
 La France, en le voyant sur sa couche étendu,
 Implorant un accent de cette voix chérie.
 Hélas! au cri plaintif jeté par la patrie
 C'est la première fois qu'il n'a pas répondu.'

Consequently, protocol aside, her presence was important to underscore the theme of national unity and mourning.

The notion of widespread admiration from outside the liberal group served not only to enhance Foy's glory, but also to create the image of growing support for his cause. Victor Hugo's role in this procession parallels that of Châteaubriand in the bas-relief of Foy in the Deputies' Chamber, as another expropriation by the opposition of an eminent royalist supporter and an attempt to undermine the right wing. As an acknowledged genius and already a poet of some considerable distinction, Hugo's allegiance carried great weight. Both Châteaubriand and Hugo's distinctive recognizable profiles emerge clearly from the crowds depicted in the reliefs. Hugo is even depicted as one of the youths carrying the coffin. Foy, and his liberal beliefs, are literally supported by the energy of Hugo, Mérimée and David himself.

Rather than clearly aligned political leaders, these men were the future leaders of the art world. Like Châteaubriand and Delphine Gay, they were figures that attracted the youthful energy of the nation and targeting the youth and future of the nation was a far more insidious method of propaganda than simply relying on the recognized vestiges of republican and Napoleonic allegiances. The moment of the procession had passed and no longer represented a threat to the regime. Instead a greater challenge was illustrated in the promise of future events, the promise of renewed, continued participation in liberal politics and indeed it proved prophetic. The young figures depicted were also part of an emergent romantic movement which had

originally allied itself with royalism and Catholicism, but eventually slipped into the liberal camp. In 1829 Hugo's play *Marion de Lorme* was banned when the depiction of a distinctly lethargic Louis XIII was recognized as a caricature of Charles X.⁵⁹ Furthermore, the work of romantic painters such as Gericault, with his painting of the *Raft of the Medusa* and Delacroix, with works such as *Greece on the Ruins of Missolonghi*, cemented the link between romantic painting and liberal thought.

The relation between various iconographic details of the Foy monument and of projects sponsored by the Bourbons reinforces the idea that the tomb was meant as an intentional and 'direct provocation' to the regime. A link between David's *Funeral* and Gérard's bas-relief of the *Translation of the Remains of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette* at the *Chapelle Expiatoire* has already been recognized, but only as source for the originality of the concept of representing the funeral procession.⁶⁰ (ill. 47) David would have been aware of this work, but the significance of the relationship transcends the simple question of sources. The reference to Gérard's bas-relief needs to be seen against the larger context of location and symbolic meaning. The two projects were the product and embodiment of divergent political visions and the consciousness of this opposition was embedded in the very fabric of Foy's tomb. In 1825, the comparison between Foy's funeral and royal funerary processions such as that of 1815 and the more recent funeral of Louis XVIII in 1824, would have been apparent. Séchon and

⁵⁹Victor Hugo, *Oeuvres choisies*, p. 465

⁶⁰See J. de Caso, *David d'Angers*, p.121 and Antoinette le Normand Romain, 'Le Monument du General Foy...', *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de l'art français*, p. 185

Couturier's description of Foy's funeral, printed with three engraved illustrations, and clearly liberal in spirit, distinguished between the 'funeral processions of kings...those columns of armed men whose role was less to mourn than to keep the people at bay...in the midst of this imposing pomp, did I search for tears? No...'⁶¹ The opposition between the sterile etiquette of the royal ceremonies and the rhetoric of national mourning, public participation and grand gestures surrounding the Foy funeral also emerges in the comparison of their iconography. David may have adopted the sidelong view of Gérard's *Translation*, as if the viewer were standing on the sidelines and witnessing the procession itself, but the realism of David's work, and the up-to-date atmosphere of the Foy procession encouraged a feeling of participation and empathy. In contrast, the *Translation*, with its classically draped mourners, bears no relation to real time and the viewer is not asked to participate. This contrast is an accurate portrayal of the opposing atmospheres and intentions of the actual events as in 1815 the police had cleared the streets for the royal translation, and the populace had watched the procession from behind the armed regiments of Paris bordering the route.⁶²

The means with which the remains were accompanied to their final resting place is equally of great significance. In 1815 the royal remains had been placed on a hearse accompanied by twelve guards, and then carried by them into Saint Denis.⁶³ The hearse is visible in Gérard's bas-relief, but the guards have been replaced by a number of

⁶¹C. Séchon and A. Couturier, *Journée du 30 Novembre, 1825, Notice accompagnée de trois planches gravées*, Paris, n.d

⁶²*Moniteur Universel*, No. 20, 20 January 1815

⁶³*Moniteur Universel*, No. 23, 23 January 1815

young men in drapery. The symbolic importance of the actual means of transport must have outweighed the classicizing impulse, as it is the source of the only intrusion of realism and the contemporary upon the timeless scene. One of the bearer's drapery falls open to reveal tight breeches, a coat, sash and epaulettes: the uniform of the King's men-at-arms. In contrast, at General Foy's funeral, the students and youth of Paris clamoured for the right to carry their leader to the cemetery. For over seven hours the crowd took turns until they had reached their destination. This bodily transport of Foy's remains to Père Lachaise was a particularly important form of homage, whose subversive nature was borne out by attempts to prevent any subsequent occurrence. After Foy's funeral, the Prefect of the Seine passed an ordinance banning anyone from bodily carrying coffins during funeral processions.⁶⁴ In 1827 two funerals underlined the significance of the banned form of homage. Despite the ordinance, the threat of legal fines and punishment, at the Duc de Rochefoucauld's funeral, the police had to prevent mourners from carrying of the coffin. For Manuel, famous liberal upstart, similar attempts were made. Mourners were prevented from doing so by mounted police surrounding the hearse. Meanwhile, other police drew their swords and blocked the procession's path until the coffin was returned to the hearse. Frustrated in their efforts, the crowd detached the horses and proceeded to pull the hearse themselves but the procession was once again halted and the horses returned to their position.⁶⁵

⁶⁴Froment, *La Police dévoilée*, Paris, 1829, vol. 3, p. 54

⁶⁵Jean-Claude Caron, *Généralités romantiques: Les étudiants de Paris et le quartier latin, 1814-1851*, Paris, 1991, p.280; A. Marrast, 'Les Funérailles révolutionnaires', *Paris révolutionnaire*, vols 1-4, Paris, 1838, vol. 3, p. 266; and Froment, *La Police dévoilée*, Paris, 1829, vol. 3, pp. 55-63

The use of Foy's tomb as a response both politically and aesthetically to the Chapelle Expiatoire is further exemplified in its upper portion. (ill. 92) The inclusion of a full-length statue had been specified in the rules of the competition, but its elaboration functioned as a counter-image to Bourbon propagandist iconography.⁶⁶ This was partly embroiled in the debate over the use of contemporary dress or classical garb. The monument commission may have been inclined towards military dress, given that one of the commissioners, J. L. Ternaux, had previously had a letter published in the *Constitutionnel* on 2 December, 1825, which proposed that Foy be represented life-size, on a slightly elevated pedestal, in an attitude of oration and of virtuous indignation, with eyes raised towards heaven, one hand on his sword and the other grasping the Charter. Vaudoyer may have been responding to this predilection in two early drawings which show the general not only in a military uniform, but precisely in the same pose described by Ternaux.⁶⁷ (ills. 93 and 94) Only one of these drawings is dated, 1 November, 1826, indicating an early stage of development and David d'Angers seems to have initially complied with the use of modern dress, as one of his drawings also depicts the general in military costume.⁶⁸ (ill. 95) However, David was probably responsible for the eventual switch from modern dress to classical drapery.

⁶⁶ The public competition for the monument stipulated the full-length statue sheltered by an open tempietto. E., 'Architecture - Concours ouvert pour le monument à élever au général Foy, Prix décerné à Vaudoyer', *Revue Encyclopédique*, vol. XXX, May 1826, p. 584

⁶⁷ One drawing is dated 1 November, 1826. Musée Carnavalet. Gesture and pose conform to the proposal offered by J. L. Ternaux, 'Lettre..' *Constitutionnel*, 2 December, 1825

⁶⁸ Galerie David d'Angers, Angers

David's writing indicates a preference for reserving modern dress to the footnotes, or biographical bas-reliefs, claiming that modern dress was too fickle to be appropriate for the principal portion of a monument meant to defy the centuries, but the evidence of his production does not always bear this out.⁶⁹ While some of David's monuments adopt classical drapery, such as the *Bonchamps* (1819-25), just as many use modern dress and some of these were executed around the same time as Foy's. His *Fénélon* (1828, ill. 81), *General Gobert* (1833, ill. 83) and *Gouvion Saint-Cyr* (1832, ill. 96) are all depicted in contemporary costume. Furthermore, the Gobert and Gouvion-Saint-Cyr monuments were, like that of Foy, conceived for Père Lachaise.

Classical drapery might be a reference to the traditional dress of the Roman orator for Foy is represented as if in the midst of oration. This would seem to prioritize Foy as politician above all else, with reference to Foy's military career limited to a sword crowned with a wreath leaning against a small box-like pedestal behind him: as in Foy's life, the sword is laid to rest and replaced by the mantle of politics. The statue however is not a denigration of Foy's military career at the expense of his civil one; classical garb invested the monument with a deeper symbolic meaning. If David recognized that modern dress could

⁶⁹'Ainsi quand un auteur écrit l'éloge d'un grand homme il s'empare des grands traits qui font ressortir l'âme de son héros et porte dans les notes à la fin de son oeuvre toutes les notes explicatives qui nous initient avec la vie intime de celui dont ils veulent consacrer la mémoire. Ces notes explicatives, ce sont les bas-reliefs; l'apothéose c'est la statue'; and 'Il y avait un sentiment grand et généreux dans l'idée des anciens de lancer dans l'éternité la représentation de leurs grands hommes nus, tels qu'ils étaient sortis des mains du créateur. Le besoin de l'industrie qui fait à chaque instant innover de nouvelles modes plaidera mieux la cause des artistes que tous les raisonnements. Une statue dura deux ans à exécuter, la mode pendant ce temps là aura changé plusieurs fois.' Ms. 1872, Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers

be used for the full-length portrait of great men, he distinguished figures of 'superior genius', 'eminently elevated above others', for whom a simple portrait statue was not enough. They deserved a 'statue of apotheosis', and the 'costume of apotheosis'.⁷⁰ Of Foy's tomb, David wrote, 'the statue will be heroically draped: it is the apotheosis of the subject. It places it in a different sphere from our own. It is a means of isolating a man.'⁷¹ The use of atemporal classical drapery is usually distancing, as in the case of Gérard's bas-relief. Consequently, the classicizing impulse and David's use of the term 'isolation' has led historians to see the image as 'detached from all historical context'⁷², but David's conception of apotheosis was actually a means of entering the monument into a larger political discourse.

As discussed in the previous chapter, at the time when David was working on Foy's tomb, apotheosis imagery was largely linked to Bourbon propaganda and mostly devoted to Louis XVI. In 1826, when David began work on the Foy monument, the subject was especially prominent, as Charles X had decided to re-dedicate the Place de la Concorde to Louis XVI, and an image of royal, religious apotheosis would emerge in a more public manner than any of the previous engravings, paintings, or church monuments might have imposed. After 1820, with the assassination of the Duc de Berry, apotheosis imagery was once again abundant as a means of royalist propaganda, with numerous prints portraying the new martyr's ascension towards

⁷⁰'La statue apothéose ne serait consacrée qu'aux hommes qui seraient éminemment au-dessus des autres...'Bibliothèque Municipale d'Angers, Ms 1872

⁷¹'...la statue sera drapée à l'héroïque: c'est l'apothéose du sujet. Cela le place dans une sphère différente de la nôtre.' Cited in Viviane Huchard, *Galerie David d'Angers, Musée d'Angers*, 1989, p.46

⁷²Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, 'Le Monument du Général Foy...', *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire français*, pp. 184-5

heaven.⁷³ Since the assassination was blamed on the liberals, a clear opposition between liberal action and Bourbon sanctity was established.

Quite recently the Bourbon interpretation of apotheosis had been challenged by imagery and texts produced in the wake of Napoleon's death in 1821, with works such as Barthélemy's *Apotheosis* published in Paris in 1821 and Horace Vernet's painting, *Napoleon's Tomb*, also known as the *Apotheosis of Napoleon* (1821, ill. 97).⁷⁴ Contemporaries, both liberal and royalist, also perceived the glorification of Foy as a particularly dangerous threat to the canonical, Bourbon re-interpretation of apotheosis, by its association with revolutionary heroes. Louis Belmontet's poem *The Funeral of General Foy*, (1825), compared the honours rendered to Foy with the pantheonization of Voltaire and Mirabeau.⁷⁵ The frontispiece of Séchon and Couturier's account and engravings of Foy's funeral made the connection even clearer, depicting the Pantheon as still bearing the inscription removed by the Bourbons: 'Aux Grands Homme, la Patrie Reconnaissante'; and claiming that this was where Foy should have been laid to rest. These parallels outraged the right, who claimed in various publications, that

⁷³See Armand Dayot, *La Restauration: Louis XVIII à Charles X, d'après l'image du temps*, Paris, n.d., p. 49

⁷⁴Vernet's painting represents Napoleon's grave on the rock at Saint Helena. The ghosts of Napoleon, crowned with a laurel wreath, and a number of his dead Marshals observe from above. Vernet sold the painting and a replica in 1821. It was also engraved that year by Jazet. In 1822 one of the versions was exhibited, draped in black, in Vernet's studio. (Wallace Collection, P575) John Ingramells, *The Wallace Collection, Catalogue of Pictures, II: French Nineteenth Century*, London, 1986, p. 267. Ingres was also inspired to illustrate the *Apotheosis of Napoleon* in 1821. A brown wash and graphite sketch later inspired the painting he produced for Napoleon III in 1853 for the Hôtel de Ville in Paris. (British Museum 1949. 2. 6)

⁷⁵Louis Belmontet, *Les Funérailles du Général Foy*, Paris, 1825

the 'absurd idolatry' of Foy's glorification⁷⁶ recalled 'that period of atrocious recollection, when the Marats and their like received monuments'⁷⁷ It is probably no coincidence therefore, that Vaudoyer's tempietto greatly resembles the cenotaph erected to shelter the remains of Rousseau, exhibited in the Tuilleries in 1794, before his pantheonization. The design had more recently been taken up by Lebas for the Malsherbes - one of the legal defenders of Louis XVI and Restoration hero - monument in the Palais de Justice. The monument stands flush to the wall, with a tempietto sheltering a free standing statue of Malsherbes, but Lebas' original design had been of a free standing tempietto. Léon Vaudoyer would have been familiar with these plans and the completed monument, as Lebas was not only a teacher in his father's studio, but also his cousin.⁷⁸ Vaudoyer's design for the Foy monument served therefore both as a retrieval of republican pantheonization or apotheosis and as a counter-statement to a specific commemorative monument sponsored by the Restoration.

While David's use of classical garb and the references embodied in the architectural design may have been lost on the masses, popular imagery guaranteed that the Foy monument was clearly implicated in the discourse regarding apotheosis. Prints produced following the general's death illustrate a pervasive notion of heroic glorification and more precisely of secular apotheosis. Various prints appeared

⁷⁶*La Souscription ou les enrôlements révolutionnaires*, Paris, 1825, p. 18

⁷⁷'...ces temps d'exécrables mémoires, où les Marat et ses pareils obtinrent des monuments'. *Adresse respectueuse à son altesse royale le duc d'Orléans à l'occasion du monument projeté pour le générale Foy*, par un electeur, Paris, 1825, p. 7. Reference to Marat was also made by his nickname, l'ami du peuple: '...rappeler les funérailles d'un autre ami du peuple à l'occasion de celles de Foy...', *La Souscription ou les enrôlements révolutionnaires*, p. 18

⁷⁸For relation between the Masherbes and Foy monuments see Barry Bergdoll, *Léon Vaudoyer*, pp. 69-70

depicting Foy ascending towards his greater glory. At least two separate versions of the *Apotheosis of Général Foy* depict the crowd gathered around Foy's tomb at the funeral.⁷⁹ (ills. 98 and 99) Soldiers, politicians, women and children gather round amongst the surrounding tombs. A priest officiates at the ceremony, while the general's coffin waits behind him. As in the descriptions of the funeral, the coffin, draped in palms, a military hat and cloak, complete with epaulettes, is carried by a number of young men. Hovering just above the coffin is a draped General Foy, reclining imperially in the arms of a winged genius. There is no reference to religious and spiritual rewards. Foy's apotheosis is completely secular, achieving renown, fame and eternal life in the memory of the people.

The erection of the Foy monument reaffirmed a democratic principle of commemoration on the basis of individual merit, an Enlightenment ideal which until the Revolution had largely remained at the discursive stage. Under the Bourbon Restoration the Pantheon had been returned to its religious function, and the public space, as well as the language and imagery of glorification, had been re-appropriated as the exclusive domain of the monarch. Maurice Agulhon has pointed out that despite this, the Restoration and other successive regime's were 'liberal enough so that...the heroes of the opposition could be buried with dignity in cemeteries; but not enough so that they could be honoured with monuments at the crossroads.'⁸⁰ Agulhon however was

⁷⁹Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Estampes, QB1 (1825-1831)

⁸⁰'La France du siècle dernier resta longtemps dans une position moyenne, assez libérale pour que les morts mal-pensants et les héros de l'opposition fussent ensevelis dignement dans les cimetières; mais pas assez pour qu'ils puissent être tous honorés de monuments au carrefour.' Maurice Agulhon, "Les Tombeaux du 'Grand Homme' au XIXe siècle, À propos de *Monuments funéraires* de César Daly (1873, 1878)", *Gazette des beaux-arts*, vol. CVI, November 1985, p. 160

mistaken, for there were important exceptions to this liberal attitude, as in the case of Marshal Ney, executed in 1815, whose tomb at Père Lachaise was secretly moved from its original site to another part of the cemetery and forced to remain without a marker. Moreover, elaborate funeral monuments like Foy's have all too often been interpreted as sublimation for the lack of public urban commemoration. It is important to recall that the funerary monument actually allowed, for greater freedom of expression than its urban counterpart might have, for the possibility of making antagonistic statements about the government and a means of escaping censorship, particularly at times when gatherings and newspapers were censored. As André Marrast wrote in 1838: 'Today...we have noisy, agitated funerals, where memories are more important than grief, where the burial of the past threatens the present.'⁸¹

Marrast was referring to the events of the past few years, during which the Foy monument was only one of a series that sought to express political ideas antagonistic to the Restoration regime. For the most part they share certain characteristics with the Foy monument, being mostly the product of public subscriptions and often involving the work of a politically engaged artist, such as David d'Angers. Beginning in 1820, the death of a student Nicolas Lallemand, killed while demonstrating against electoral changes, as he cried 'Vive la Charte!', provided the opportunity for making a public political statement with the funeral procession and a public subscription for a

⁸¹'Aujourd'hui...nous avons des obsèques bruyantes, agitées, où les souvenirs ont plus de part que la douleur, où l'on menace le présent en enterrant le passé.' A. Marrast, 'Les Funérailles révolutionnaires', *Paris révolutionnaire*, Paris, vol. 3, p. 220

monument. The monument was funded mostly by the different schools of Paris, who recorded their solidarity on the final monument, whose only decoration is the names of the *École des Beaux-arts, de Médecine, de Droit* and *de Commerce*. (ill. 100) The plainness of this purely architectural monument is very similar, even in its design, to that of the actor Talma. As discussed previously, Talma's death in 1826, the public subscription and monuments elicited, were also implicated in an anti-clerical discourse, antagonistic to the Restoration regime. In 1827, the government attempted to halt the massive demonstrations the death of these liberal heroes had elicited in the past years, by censoring the news of Manuel's death, but the number of mourners were nonetheless reputedly even greater than at Foy's funeral.⁸² The mourners at Manuel's funeral had been overwhelmingly proletarian, with their rolled up sleeves and bare arms, as opposed to the bourgeois character of Foy's following.⁸³ For some, this explained the difference between Foy's mausoleum 'glittering and ostentatious like the Empire was' and Manuel's simple tomb, obscure and solitary, whose only decoration was a portrait medallion by David d'Angers.⁸⁴ Quite possibly, the change in the political situation could also account for the difference between the two tombs.

In 1830, Manuel was still awaiting his monument, but after July its political significance had largely been negated, perhaps making a grandiose statement less appealing. In comparison with Foy's, the only

⁸²A. Marrast, 'Les Funérailles révolutionnaires', *Paris révolutionnaire*, Paris, 1838, vol. 3, p. 266

⁸³A. Marrast, 'Les Funérailles révolutionnaires', *Paris révolutionnaire*, Paris, vol. 3, p. 270

⁸⁴'...brillant et fastueux comme fut l'Empire...' A. Marrast, 'Les Funérailles révolutionnaires', *Paris révolutionnaire*, Paris, vol. 3, p. 273

obvious political references on the Manuel's tomb were embodied by his famous words uttered in the Chamber of Deputies, before he was bodily removed: 'Yesterday I announced that I would concede only to force. Today I have come to fulfill my promise. (Session of 4 March, 1823)', engraved on a bronze plaque and referring to the deputy's expulsion from the Chamber in 1823.⁸⁵ (ill. 101) While these monuments shared an anti-Bourbon sentiment, the opposition between ostentation, grandeur and simplicity was however taking on political significance. As André Marrast's work 'Les Funérailles révolutionnaires', published in 1838, . . . an early study of this established practice of using funerals and tombs as a means of making anti-establishment statements, a topic more recently taken up by Antoinette Le Normand-Romain⁸⁶, shows, the practice continued to be used throughout the rest of the Nineteenth Century at Père Lachaise and other cemeteries as well, such as in 1836, with the death of Armand Carrel, a republican journalist and co-founder of the *National*, killed in a duel by Émile de Girardin, director of *La Presse*. Carrel, like Talma before him, demanded a strictly civil burial, with no religious officials or ceremony. His tomb erected in the cemetery of Saint-Mandé was the product of a public subscription, and David produced the full scale statue of Carrel, whom he depicted in the midst of oration, in a memorable speech to the Chamber of Peers, where he accused them of having assassinated Ney.⁸⁷ (ill. 102) By mid-century however

⁸⁵'Hier j'ai annoncé que je ne céderais qu'à la force. Aujourd'hui je viens tenir ma parole. (Séance du 4 Mars, 1823)'

⁸⁶Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, "'En hommage aux opposants politiques', Monument funéraire ou publique?", *Revue de l'Art*, No. 94, 1991, pp. 74-80

⁸⁷Larousse, *Dictionnaire universel*, Paris, vol. 3, 1867, p.447

a marked difference can be discerned in the format of these monuments to anti-establishment heroes.

In 1845, the republican Godefroy Cavaignac (1801-1845) died. His militant activities against the July Monarchy earned him a prison sentence, and after his escape in 1835, exile in England until 1841.⁸⁸ The political significance of Cavaignac's monument by François Rude (1784-1855) - also of republican sympathies - representing the deceased as a *gisant*, was enhanced by the intervening change in the political situation of the nation and the rise of the Second Empire by the time its inauguration in Montmartre cemetery in 1856. (ill. 103)

In 1853 the politician and astronomer Dominique-François Arago (1786-1853) died and a public subscription for a tomb was launched. David d'Angers produced a sketch of a *gisant* figure for the tomb, but the artist's own death in 1856 prevented the project from going any further. In 1838, David had produced a bust of Arago, exhibited at the 1839 Salon, which was then cast in 1858, by Eck and Durand, for the tomb at Père Lachaise.⁸⁹ The death of the journalist Victor Noir (1848-1870) in a duel with Prince Pierre Bonaparte in 1870 transformed Noir into a political martyr overnight. Noir was murdered on the Prince's doorstep as he delivered a challenge on the part of a fellow journalist. The Prince shot the messenger but was acquitted of murder and Noir's funeral and monument became symbols of discontent and political opposition. However, the impetus of the propaganda movement was halted by the fall of the Empire only a year later and the bronze *gisant* by Jules Dalou (1838-1902) was only inaugurated at Père Lachaise in

⁸⁸Larousse, *Dictionnaire universel*, Paris, vol. 4, 1869, p. 636

⁸⁹*Inventaire générale des richesses de l'Art de la France, Paris, Monuments civils*, vol. 3, Paris, 1902, pp. 198-199

1891. (ill. 104) Dalou also adopted the *gisant* format for the tomb of the socialist politician Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881), who like Cavaignac spent many years in jail for his political beliefs. The tomb, with the bronze figure of Blanqui was financed by public subscription and erected at Père Lachaise in 1885. (ill. 105)

The similarities between the conception of these anti-establishment projects, by three different artists, the uses of the *gisant* figure, all highlight a shared aesthetic and ideological language that had shifted since the days of the Foy project. To begin with the use of the *gisant* made the kinship with traditional funeral images more apparent, especially with the Cavaignac tomb, which recalls the Renaissance tradition of a draped, reclining nude corpse found on some of the royal tombs at Saint Denis, such as that of Henri II and Catherine de Medecis by Germain Pilon (1563-1570). In all three the image of final, violent, abrupt death and even decay are emphasized, an idea, which along with skeletons and skulls had largely been omitted in tomb sculpture since the late Eighteenth Century, replaced by a peaceful notion of cemeteries as Fields of Rest. According to the art critic Mantz even in the middle ages the *gisant* had been relatively peaceful, but the modern transformation adopted by artists such as Rude was intended to give a certain meaning to these images of unrest:

'For the naive stonecutters of that period, death was restful...the knight of the Middle Ages went to sleep one evening dressed in his armour, and, he was laid out on his silent tomb, hand joined, a dog at his feet, the artist represented him in a tranquil state...Alas! was have been robbed of that heavenly repose! It would seem, and that was surely the idea that Rude was trying to

put across, that modern man retains some of the anxieties of his previous existence in the tomb, and that for him, the confusion of life continue beyond the grave.'⁹⁰

The notion of continuing struggle, embodied in Cavaignac's rigid, emaciated physical frame, its head thrown back by the effects of rigor mortis, emphasized the fact that the political battle he had engaged in during his lifetime still raged with the advent of the Second Empire. Moreover, the body, subject to decay, could be compared to the lasting power of Cavaignac's work, symbolized by the sword and quill next to his right hand. In this case the pen is not necessarily portrayed as mightier than the sword, but as an equally powerful weapons. The similarity with David's sketch for Arago is striking: wrapped in a burial shroud like Cavaignac, he holds a quill which rests on some unfurled sheets of paper. With the tomb of Victor Noir, the image of the journalist fully dressed in contemporary clothing, his hat lying on the ground next to him, as if he has just fallen to his death, would have been a constant reminder of the senselessness brutality of the event.

While sharing a politically oppositional character with monuments such as Foy's, the form and iconography of the monuments to Cavaignac, Arago and Noir were more linked to traditional funerary monuments rather than to public urban ones. The Foy monument represents an earlier model, which like the Carrel monument is more

⁹⁰Pour les naifs tailleurs d'images de ce temps, la mort était un repos...le chevalier du moyen âge s'endormait un soir dans son armure, et, en l'étendant tout d'une pièce sur sa tombe silencieuse, les mains jointes, un chien à ses pieds, l'artiste le représentait tranquille...Hélas! ce repos suprême nous est enlevé! Il semble, et telle est sans doute l'idée que Rude a voulu traduire, que l'homme moderne conserve dans le tombeau quelque chose des inquiétudes de son existence antérieure, et que pour lui les tumultes de la vie se continuent au delà de la mort.' Paul Mantz, quoted in Pierre Larousse, *Dictionnaire universel*, Paris, vol. 4, 1869, p.636

celebratory in nature, emphasizing the life of the individuals concerned rather than their deaths. Despite the use of classical drapery for the statue of Foy, both he and Carrel are depicted as active individuals; in the midst of oration. This format had as much to do with the perception of the function and appropriate style of the cemetery monument as it did with specific political beliefs or anti-establishment statements. When Gouvion Saint-Cyr died in 1830, he had had prominent careers under both the Empire and the Restoration and it would have been difficult to perceive any opposition propaganda in his commemorative monument, commissioned privately by his widow for Père Lachaise. Yet the monument completed by David (c. 1833) is indeed similar to the Foy and Carrel monuments, with its full-scale statue backed by a mini amphitheatre, implying a symbolic captive audience addressed by the marshal.

The Foy, Carrel and Gouvion Saint-Cyr monuments, among others shared a certain opulence, a grandeur that likened them to large-scale public projects. It was perhaps in part this lavishness, this opulence that the anti-establishment monuments were reacting against. As mentioned above, in 1838, Marrast had described the character of the Foy monument as ostentatious and showy, characterizations which were actually politically loaded. In one of Balzac's stories, 'L'Auberge rouge', first published in the *Revue de Paris* in August 1831, subscription to the Foy monument was actually used to characterize a particular individual and at a dinner party, a guest is described simply as a landowner who had subscribed for the Foy monument.⁹¹ The

⁹¹Honoré de Balzac, *Oeuvres complètes*, revised and annotated by Marcel Bouteron and Henri Longnon 40 vols, Paris, 1912-1940, vol. 29, p. 313

implication of the monument being a largely bourgeois affair was particularly important when Balzac was writing, for, after July 1830, liberal politicians who had stood together against the Restoration had split into separate camps. There were those like Casimir Périer, who had been associated with Foy during the Restoration, and appeared on his tomb, but came to represent the bourgeois nature of the new regime, opposing a left wing republican element. Foy himself had been a moderate liberal and the feeling was he would have welcomed the direction in which the new regime was moving. Certainly the Orleans monarchy celebrated him by commissioning a full-scale statue to be placed in the Palais Bourbon. After 1830, anti-establishment monuments were for the large part republican ones and it seems likely that there was a concerted rejection of what the Foy monument stood for. Therefore, while the Cavaignac and Arago monuments, for example, were like the Foy, opposition statements, they would necessarily avoid the ostentation, the showy character of the Foy, which had become associated with the bourgeois element the republicans were fighting against. The sobriety, the severity and the emphasis on the funereal may in fact be interpreted as a distinctly republican formula for commemoration that directly opposed the pomp of the Foy project.

With such a strong tradition of using the cemetery as a podium for politically oppositional expression, it is hardly surprising that there was at least one attempt for appropriating the cemetery as a site of ideological propagation for official political use under the July Monarchy. The erection of the monument to Casimir Périer between 1832 and 1837 on the site of one of Brongniart's coveted *ronds-points*

attempted to cash in on the advertising possibilities offered by the erection of monuments in the most popular of Parisian cemeteries in a manner more clearly related to the Foy monument than to the likes of Cavaignac, in its opulence and grandeur, vying with the public monument.

Chapter Five

The Monument to Casimir Périer, 1832-1837: Finding the 'Juste Milieu' for Orleanist Propaganda

In many ways the monument erected to Casimir Périer seems analogous to that of the Foy, both being the result of highly publicized national public subscriptions. Both men were prominent political figures and members of the liberal opposition during the Restoration and had not Foy died in 1825 he might even have shared Périer's political success under the July Monarchy as Prime Minister from the 13 March, 1831 until his own death on the 16 May, 1832. However, in comparison to the attention devoted to the Foy, little has actually been written about the Périer monument. While often mentioned as an impressive, imposing monument, significantly located in the centre of one of Brongniart's *ronds-points*, authors have had little else to say about it. In relation to the Foy, the iconography of the monument seems to offer little challenge or excitement, with its full-length bronze portrait statue surmounting a base decorated with reliefs of three allegorical virtues, *Justice*, *Eloquence* and *Fortitude*, by Cortot.¹ (ill. 106)

As early as 1852, B. Gastineau's guidebook to the Père Lachaise had already dubbed the arrangement a 'bizarre combination'.² Not twenty years after the monument's erection, Gastineau's perplexity is informative, and indicative that lack of interest may actually stem from lack of comprehension. Unlike Foy, when Périer died in 1832 he was no longer a member of the opposition and not only did he epitomize the current Orléans government's political position, he was largely credited

¹*Justice, Eloquence and Fermeté*

²'...étrange accouplement...' B. Gastineau, *Le Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1854, p. 52

with its creation. If frequent use of the cemetery by the liberal opposition during the Bourbon Restoration resulted in establishing the reputation of Père Lachaise as the locus of anti-establishment expression, it may also have served as an example of the possibilities the cemetery might offer for propagating official political ideology as well. From this point of view, the iconography of the Périer monument suddenly appears much more complex and convoluted, replete with meaning that had been lost to audiences ignorant of the political circumstances the monument was erected in. The same can also be said of its proportions and design, which Gastineau in 1852 characterized as being 'large; but' he continued, 'all this architecture seems heavy, pompous and inappropriate for a cemetery.'² If the Casimir Périer monument appeared inappropriate as a funeral monument to succeeding generations, it may be because it was conceived of as being public and official in nature - analogous but not synonymous characteristics - and more akin to monuments erected in the public space. During the July Monarchy, the erection of individual contemporary monuments in the capital was mostly limited to historical as opposed to recent political figures. These circumstances, combined with an apparent exigency of erecting a public monument to Casimir Périer, made the ambivalent private yet public nature of the cemetery perfectly suited for the job.

The history of the erection of the monument reveals what seems to be a considerable lack of real interest in its funding, design and execution. To begin with there is the infamous story of the monument

²'Les proportions du monument sont larges, mais toute cette architecture nous paraît lourde, orgueilleuse, et n'est nullement appropriée à un cimetière.' B. Gastineau, *Le Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1854, p. 52

commission's most lackadaisical method of choosing an architect. Instead of the usual competitions, lengthy deliberations or careful study of proposals, the names of three architects Jean-Louis Provost³, Auguste-Nicolas Caristie⁴, and Achille Leclère⁵ were very simply placed in a hat and the name of the lucky winner was drawn.⁶ Thus in January of 1833, Achille Leclère received the commission for Pérrier's monument in what might be considered a most radically democratic means for allocating commissions. However, these three architects had not been the commissioner's first choice as they had initially asked Fontaine and Percier, two architects who had largely dominated official projects under the Empire and throughout the Restoration. Who better then to design what would ultimately be a project embodying official Orleanist propaganda? Unfortunately the two architects declined. Fontaine wrote to the President of the commission of 28 November, 1832, claiming that advancing age was a handicap as the monument should 'contain the character of the present era' and suggested instead the names of three capable younger architects.⁷ Since none of these architects had the symbolic resonance of Percier and Fontaine, in a sense it may not have mattered which one received the commission, and while a competition could cost money, the hat was free. There is no record of the method of choosing the sculptor, but the choice of

³Winner of the 1811 Grand Prix and architect of the Chamber of Peers. Pierre-François-Léonard Fontaine, *Journal 1799-1853*, 2 vols, Paris, 1987, vol. 2, p. 954

⁴Student of Vaudoyer, Grand Prix winner of 1813, and in 1827 Inspector general of the Bâtiments civils. Fontaine, *Journal*, vol. 2, 1987, p. 954

⁵Achille-François Leclère, 1785-1853, student of Percier, 1808 Grand Prix, Institut member 2 April, 1831. Fontaine, *Journal*, vol. 2, 1987, p. 954

⁶*Biographie universelle (Michaud), ancienne et moderne*, vols. 1-45, Paris, 1843-, vol. 23, p. 531

⁷'...un édifice qui doit spécialement porter le caractère de l'époque où nous sommes...', Pierre-François-Léonard Fontaine, *Journal*, vol. 2, 1987, p. 953

Cortot may be understood within the same context as that of Fontaine and Percier, since the sculptor had been responsible for some of the most important official commissions during the Restoration.

Périer's funeral procession on 19 May 1832 paled in comparison with that of Foy, several years earlier. Although still an impressive turnout, only 30,000 mourners made their way through the streets of Paris to the cemetery, in comparison to the 100,000 claimed for Foy's funeral.⁸ Furthermore, according to Heinrich Heine (1797-1856), even amongst those who attended Périer's funeral, a 'cold indifference' reigned.⁹ That indifference seemed to apply to the funding of the monument as well, as the public subscription launched for that purpose quickly revealed a considerable lack of public support. The public had risen to the challenge after Foy's death, raising a million francs in subscriptions but only days after Périer's death reports in official newspapers were already admitting that this subscription would not raise as much money as Foy's had. The *Moniteur* was content to reprint an article from the *Journal des Débats*, explaining that the reason for the difference was that Foy had been poor, and much of the money raised had been for his widow and children.¹⁰

Given Périer's personal wealth, one might have expected his family to come to the project's rescue, an opinion which Fontaine recorded in his journal on December 7, 1832:

'The sum of around 50 thousand francs, the amount of the donations gathered from public recognition, is all that will be put

⁸*Moniteur Universel*, No. 17, 17 January, 1838

⁹Heinrich Heine, Paris, '27 May, 1832', *De la France*, VIII, *Sämtliche Werke*, Jean-René Derré and Christiane Giesen, eds., vols. 1-15 Hamburg, 1975-1982, vol. 12, 1980, p. 368

¹⁰*Moniteur Universel*, No. 144, 23 May, 1832

towards the execution of the monument unless, as one might assume, the family does not decide to complement with its own *deniers* the necessary sum to create a remarkable work...'11

No records have yet revealed the extent, if any, of the family's involvement with the monument project, but it is certain that their support would have altered the character and significance of the project, for, as the *Moniteur* pointed out, the significance of the subscription and the monument was not based on financial necessity, rather 'in this proposition, already so favourably received, one must see a political accolade for the courageous minister and a duty that France would like to fulfill towards him and herself.'12 The involvement of Périér's family would have transformed the monument into a private tomb, the commemoration of an individual man, when what was sought after was public and national recognition and the glorification of a political regime.

Other reasons were therefore offered to explain away this apparent unpopularity. According to Antoine Jean Mathieu, baron Séguier (1768-1848), president of the monument commission, the project's inherent unpopularity stemmed from the fickle nature of the French public and his views on the matter were recorded in Fontaine's *Journal*:

'The president told me that the people, and more precisely the French people, do not reward services as well as they do adulation...They like what flatters their feelings. Any resistance

¹¹Fontaine, *Journal*, vol. 2, 1987, p. 953

¹²'...dans cette proposition, déjà si favorablement accueilli, il faut voir une distinction politique pour le ministre courageux et un devoir que la France voudra remplir envers lui et envers elle même.' *Moniteur Universel*, No. 144, 23 May, 1832

to power appeals to them and any losses that power sustains, the people consider to their advantage. General Foy, whose memory was honoured in quite a spectacular way in 1825, would have, had he become a minister, have been treated in the same manner as Casimir Périer, and instead of a million, 50 thousand francs would have been the sum of the public's recognition.'¹³

These clumsy explanations masked the fact that the real source of the project's unpopularity stemmed from its political significance. Every *centime* donated to the Foy subscription had been an act of political assertion and donations to the Périer fund were similarly tainted with a specific political appurtenance, alluded to in the *Moniteur's* assertion that it would be 'a tomb voluntarily funded by all the friends of order'.¹⁴

The principle of order had been one of the most important bywords of the regime since the beginning, as a guarantee against the chaos of revolutionary disorder in the past. In order to illustrate its importance to the present system of government, among a number of allegorical statues commissioned in 1830 to decorate the Salle des Séances of the Chamber of Deputies at the Palais Bourbon, a figure of *Public Order* was commissioned from the sculptor James Pradier (1790-1852). Pradier was also commissioned to create a figure of *Liberty*, second byword of the regime. The figures of *Public Order* and *Liberty*

¹³'Les peuples m'a dit le président, et plus particulièrement celui de France, payent beaucoup moins les services que l'adulation. Ils aiment ce qui flatte les passions. Toute résistance au pouvoir leur plaît, et ils regardent comme profits pour eux les pertes que l'on peut leur faire éprouver. Le général Foy dont la mémoire fut honoré d'une manière assez éclatante en 1825 aurait, s'il été devenu ministre, été traité comme Casimir Périer, et au lieu d'un million, cinquante mille francs serait le chiffre de la reconnaissance public à son égard.', Fontaine, 7 December, 1832, *Journal*, vol. 2, 1987, p. 955

¹⁴*Moniteur Universel*, No. 144, 23 May, 1832

were singled out for greater importance than the other allegorical statues, being larger and more costly, as Pradier received 15,000 francs apiece for these, while the other sculptors only received 8,000 for their figures.¹⁵ (ill. 107) P rier's ministry had been characterized by the zeal with which he applied himself to maintaining these concepts, declaring only days after taking office: 'At home, order, without sacrificing liberty; abroad, peace without sacrificing honour.'¹⁶ If the funding of the monument rested on the 'friends of order' as the *Moniteur* stated, it was essentially relying on the supporters of the present government. As opposed to the Foy subscription, in 1832 opposition was demonstrated not by contribution, but by abstention and the lack of sufficient response to the P rier monument subscription could largely be ascribed to the unpopularity of the political ideology it symbolized.

Having demonstrated that the impetus for the monument was not the product of the love and devotion of family and friends, it may even be said that it was also not truly erected out of respect or even admiration, but was largely the product of fear. To begin with Louis-Philippe himself had disliked P rier. In theory the responsibility and visibility of government control rested in the hands of the Prime Minister, but Louis-Philippe desired a more direct participation in government, which P rier had strenuously denied him.¹⁷ Upon P rier's

¹⁵Archives Nationales F²¹ 584

¹⁶Casimir P rier, 18 March, 1831. Quoted in S. Charl ty, *La Monarchie de Juillet (1830-1848)*, Paris, 1921, vol. 5 of Ernest Lavisse, *Histoire de la France contemporaine depuis la R volution jusqu'  la paix de 1919*, Paris, vols 1-10, 1920-1922, p. 58

¹⁷Paul Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet*, vols. 1-7, Paris, 1884-1892, vol.1, 1884, pp. 113-115, 'Le roi voulait gouverner, Casimir P rier voulait que le roi se content t de r gner.', Louis Blanc, *Histoire de dix ans, 1830-1840*, 5 vols, Paris, 1841-1844, vol. 3, 1844, p. 241

death the king is reported to have said: 'Is this good or bad? Only time will tell.'¹⁸ Such animosity between monarch and Prime Minister was hardly unusual though; nor was Louis-Philippe alone in his dislike of Périer, but antipathy was tempered by necessity. In January of 1832, Pierre-Paul Royer-Collard (1763-1845), journalist and politician, recorded the general feeling in the government: 'It is sufficient to see, to hear this miserable minister in the midst of this Chamber, where three-quarters of the members dislike him, but who stop and tremble at the slightest danger of his downfall.'¹⁹ That fear of what might happen if Périer was absent is the key to understanding the essential nature and meaning of the monument, a fear which became reality with Périer's death in 1832.

Casimir Périer had, like Foy, been a liberal under the Restoration, but opposition to the Restoration had in fact united a diversity of political thoughts: republicans, bonapartists and moderate liberals. The July Monarchy inherited this diversity of factions and even among those who had opposed Charles X, there emerged distinct factions within the new regime. For the most part the regime was split between the *parti de résistance* which embraced the new regime as a continuation of the principles of monarchy on a more liberal, constitutional basis and the *parti de mouvement* which desired more radical constitutional reforms.²⁰ As a result, the months following the

¹⁸A. C. Collingham, *The July Monarchy, A Political History of France 1830-1848*, London and New York, 1988, p. 69; also quoted by Louis Blanc, *Histoire de dix ans*, vol. 3, 1844, p. 241

¹⁹'Il suffit de voir, d'entendre ce malheureux ministre au milieu de cette Chambre dont les trois quarts ne l'aiment pas, mais qui s'arrête au moindre danger de le renverser.' 21 January 1832. Quoted in Thureau-Dangin, vol. 2, pp.98-99

²⁰See Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. ix

installation of the new monarchy were less than stable as these factions battled for control and economic crisis added to the instability of the situation. France was further divided by the revolutions which broke out in Belgium, Italy and Poland, virtually on the heels of its own revolutionary days in July 1830.²¹ There were those who wanted to intervene on behalf of the revolutionaries, in opposition to the government who refused to help for fear of dragging France back into an international war.²² This was the situation when P rier took over the reigns of government as Prime Minister on March 13, 1831.

After 1830, P rier had emerged as an Orleanist conservative, a member of the *parti de resistance*. The Orleanist conservatives represented the government majority of the time and were largely members of a variety of political thought, whose unifying desire was to maintain law, order and a firm steadfast government.²³ During P rier's administration, in practice this meant belying many of the liberal promises of the 1830 revolution and the formation of an increasingly conservative regime. As a result however, by the beginning of 1832 the government seemed to have finally gained control of the nation. The government party - that is to say the Orleanist conservatives - had a majority in the Chambers for the first time.²⁴ The successful strategy was dubbed the 'system of 13 March', date upon which P rier's ministry had been formed.²⁵ Much of the recent success was actually

²¹See Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. 67

²²See Pamela M. Pilbeam, 'The Emergence of Opposition to the Orleanist Monarchy, August 1830-April 1831', *English Historical Review*, vol. LXXXV, No. 334, Januray 1970, pp. 14-15

²³See Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. 113

²⁴Thureau-Dangin, vol. 2, 1884, p. 92

²⁵Thureau-Dangin, vol. 2, 1884, p. 111

attributed personally to P rier himself. It may only be at a later date that historians and biographers frequently reduced the term 'system of the 13 of March' to that of the 'P rier system', but nonetheless the Prime Minister's contemporaries considered him not only as the embodiment of the current government, but the sole figure without whom all would surely collapse.²⁶

P rier seemed to inspire the Orleanist government with a new found confidence and a sense of stability, which on the first anniversary of P rier's ministry, the 13 March, 1832, the *Journal des D bats* hailed in the following terms: 'In what state was France a year ago and in what state is she today? Is it not true that order has set in, that confidence returns and that our future is becoming brighter?'²⁷ Even Heinrich Heine, unfavourably disposed as he was to P rier, had to admit the importance of the man's position, describing him as the 'Atlas who carries the *bourse* and all the scaffolding of European power on his shoulders...'²⁸ Newspapers less favourably disposed to P rier were also obliged to concur, albeit in less flattering terms. For example, the *National*, which claimed that 'Mr. P rier has managed to persuade some good people that there is no more order, no more liberty, no more government possible in France if he left the Ministry'.²⁹

²⁶For use of the term 'P rier system' see S. Charl ty, Chapter II, entitled 'Le Syst me Casimir P rier (13 Mars-16 Mai 1832)', *La Monarchie de Juillet*, Paris, 1921, pp. 56-81, and Thureau-Dangin, vol. 2, 1884, p. 108

²⁷'Dans quel  tat  tait la France il y a un an, et dans quel  tat est-elle aujourd'hui? N'est-il pas vrai que l'ordre s'affermi, que la confiance rena t, que notre avenir s' claircit?' Quoted in Thureau-Dangin, vol. 2, 1884, p. 93

²⁸Heinrich Heine, 'Cet homme est l'Atlas qui porte sur ses  paules la bourse et tout l' chafaudage des puissances europ ennes...', 'Paris, 1 March 1832', *De la France*, IV, *S mtliche Werke*, Hamburg, vol. 12, 1980, p. 333

²⁹'Il y a de bonnes gens   qui M. P rier a r ussi   persuader qu'il n'y a plus d'ordre, plus de libert , plus de gouvernement possible en France, s'il venait   quitter le minist re.' *Le National*, 25 July, 1831. Quoted in Thureau-Dangin, vol. 2,

Just when order seemed assured, in March 1832 a cholera epidemic which had already ravaged London, hit Paris. The royal family bravely remained in Paris and lived up to their position by visiting those who were ill. Contemporaries believed that it was during one of these visits with the Duc d'Orléans to the Hôtel Dieu on the 1st of April that Casimir Périer contracted the disease. On May 16 he died: Atlas had fallen and dropped his load. No one seemed able to replace Périer, and Louis-Philippe was not keen to find anyone. Périer had largely curtailed the King's role to that of a figurehead and since Louis-Philippe wanted to play a more active role in government, he was not pressed to find another Prime Minister who might deny him this. The Comte de Montalivet (1801-1880) replaced Périer as Minister of the Interior, but no new President of the Cabinet of Ministers was chosen.³⁰ The opposition hoped that this situation would weaken the *resistance* and put an end to the system of the 13 March, but they were disappointed and angered to find that the government intended to maintain the status quo.³¹ Official propaganda had in fact almost immediately set out to remedy the apparent weakness caused by Périer's demise and establish that the system that seemed so inextricably linked to his person, would continue nonetheless.

Assertions of political continuity were immediately promoted by the *Moniteur*, which concluded its announcement of Périer's death with

1884, p. 96. Armand Carrel was the *National's* director from its inception in January 1831 until 24 July 1836 when he died in a duel with rival newspaperman Émile de Girardin. Carrel had originally taken part in the July Revolution but had become increasingly disenchanted with the regime and sided with the republicans. See Charles Ledré, *La Presse à l'assaut de la Monarchie, 1815-1848*, Paris, 1960 and Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. 443

³⁰See Louis Blanc, *Histoire de dix ans*, vol. 3, 1844: p. 240 and Thureau-Dangin, vol. 2, 1884, p. 111

³¹S. Charléty, *La Monarchie de Juillet*, Paris, 1921, p. 77

the following statement: 'May France, widow of a great citizen, know full well that nothing has changed in her political direction.'³² After months of crediting P rier with single-handedly bringing peace and order to the nation, the assertion may have seemed implausible but it was a necessary attempt to ward off the political opposition's hopes that the *parti de resistance* would be weakened by the loss of its leader.³³ As a result, it is not surprising that official propaganda was now keen to distance the government from the former Prime Minister and underplay the crucialness of his presence. The *Journal des D bats* claimed :

'It is a strange error to obstinately confound the system and the ministry of 13 March, as if the system was born and must disappear with this or that man...It is the system which makes the ministry of 13 March and not the ministry which makes the system...The system of the 13 March was born at the time of the July Revolution. It was born before P rier and will survive him.'³⁴

In order to further sustain the idea, some government supporters even sought to attribute the political system to the king himself.³⁵

³²'Que la France veuve d'un grand citoyen, sache bien qu'il n'y a rien de chang  dans ses destinations politiques.' *Moniteur Universel*, No. 138, 17 May, 1832

³³S. Charl ty, *La Monarchie de Juillet*, Paris, 1921, p. 77

³⁴'C'est une erreur  trange que de s'obstiner   confondre le syst me et le minist re du 13 mars, comme si le syst me  tait n  et devait s' teindre avec tel ou tel homme...M. P rier n'a point cr e son syst me...C'est le syst me qui fait le minist re du 13 mars et non le minist re du 13 mars qui fait le syst me. Le syst me du 13 mars a pris naissance au moment m me de la r volution de juillet...Il  tait n  avant Casmir P rier et lui survivra.' Quoted in Thureau Dangin, vol. 2, 1884, p. 112

³⁵See Heinrich Heine, 'Paris, 27 May, 1832', *De la France*, VIII, *S mtliche Werke*, , vol. 12, 1980, pp. 368-369

Despite these attempts, unrest eventually forced the creation of a new ministry on 11 October, 1832, but as the Duc de Broglie (1785-1870) wrote to Talleyrand (Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, Prince de Bénévent, 1754-1838) on the 12 October:

'The colleagues of Mr. Périer make up one half of the current Ministry, while the other half is made up by those of his political friends, who are even more implicated than he was in the cause of order and peace...'³⁶

Indeed, of the new ministers, Félix Barthe (1795-1863), Apollinaire Maurice Antoine, comte d'Argout (1782-1858), Marshal Soult (1769-1852) and Admiral Rigny (1783-1835) had all been part of the Ministry of the 13 March, and they intended to continue much as they had before. As a circular sent to all the top government officials from Soult, the new President of the Council of Ministers, clearly stated: 'The system adopted by my illustrious predecessor will be mine; it is the true national system.'³⁷ The sentiment was passed on to the public through the official press, as on 15 October, 1832, the *Journal des Débats* declared: 'The present ministry will continue the thought and the work of M. Casimir Périer.'³⁸ Under these circumstances, where the present government was so firmly balanced on the work of one man, a public monument was of the greatest necessity. Casimir Périer's monument was much more than just the commemoration of an

³⁶'Le ministère actuel est composé pour la moitié des collègues de M. Périer, pour moitié de ceux de ses amis politiques, qui plus compromis encore que lui même dans la cause de l'ordre et de la paix...' Quoted in Thureau-Dangin, vol. 2, 1884, p. 172

³⁷'Le système adopté par mon illustre prédécesseur sera le mien, c'est le vrai système national.' Quoted in Thureau-Dangin, vol.2, 1884, p. 172

³⁸'Le ministère actuel continuera la pensée et l'ouvrage de M. Casimir Périer.' Quoted in Thureau-Dangin, vol. 2, 1884, p. 172

individual man, but a symbolic foundation upon which the political future of France rested upon after his passing. The fear of P rier's downfall felt by the government even before his death now needed checking, and the monument would provide a symbolic manifestation of the strength and endurance of P rier and all he represented.

It is only as such a symbolic representation of the conservative Orleanist political system that the iconographic programme of the monument is clarified, for if interpreted purely as the customary references to P rier's career and achievements through the use of allegorical figures, the iconography does indeed seem as Gastineau remarked in 1852, a bit 'bizarre'. The figure of Eloquence, on the principle facade, facing the viewer, seems plausible enough for commemorating a statesman, and P rier was indeed eulogized at the funeral by the Duc de Choiseuil (1760-1838) as the 'eloquent defender for many years now of public liberties...'.³⁹ The inscription on the base of the monument re-iterated this, by claiming that 'he defended order and liberty within, peace and dignity abroad, with eloquence and courage'. Yet, most biographies and historical accounts seem to agree that P rier dominated his audiences by strength of character and force rather than by the eloquence of his words and, as one historian of the period has remarked: 'Lacking adroitness in debate and profundity in philosophy, he commanded the assembly by his personality: gaunt, handsome, glaring fiercely, a clenched fist held high...'⁴⁰

The historian Thureau-Danguin also wrote of the 'strong hand' of P rier, and indeed the image of that hand, tightly clenched in a fist, as

³⁹*Moniteur Universel*, No. 141, 20 May, 1832

⁴⁰Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. 61

it was captured by Cortot for the monument, seems to have symbolized the man as a whole.⁴¹ Significantly, this particular detail seems to have been added at a late stage of conception, as a preliminary watercolour by Leclère adheres almost exactly to the finished product, except for the detail of the right arm, which is bent at a ninety degree angle, pointing to the Charter held in his left hand.⁴² (ill. 108) The subsequently altered gesture was appropriately more characteristic of Périer: arm stretched taught and straight, with the hand clenched in a tight fist. (ill. 106) In 1833, when the Ministry of the Interior ordered a statue of Périer, for a room of that name in the Chamber of Deputies, the sculptor Francisque Duret (1804-1865) also chose to represent both hands clenched in tight fists, clutching a scroll, inscribed with the former Prime Minister's bywords: Order and Peace.⁴³ (ill. 109) The clenched fist was a more potent image, embodying in one, single gesture a whole range of meaning which the *Moniteur* described as the 'attitude which we adopt, when we energetically express that we wish this or that to be done'.⁴⁴

In contrast, on the monument, the figure of Eloquence - a large matronly figure in traditional pose with one hand raised in a gesture of oration and the other leaning on a column or speaker's rostrum - seems to embody calm and reason. (ill. 100) However, in the *Iconologia*, Ripa had illustrated a figure called the Force of Eloquence, holding a caduceus and with a lion underfoot, described as that through which 'the unruly Mob, threatening destruction are presently appeased, and

⁴¹'..la forte main de Périer...' Thureau-Danguin, vol. 2, 1884, p. 111

⁴²A. Leclère, *Monument à Casimir Périer*, Musée Carnavalet, D9389

⁴³Commissioned 31 August, 1833. Archive Nationales F²¹ 488

⁴⁴*Moniteur Universel*, No, 121, 9 August, 1837

lay down their arms, so soon as they hear the grave eloquent Person, remonstrate the danger of the Riot,...and they tamely submit to his Dictates.'⁴⁵ Ripa's definition seems more applicable to P rier, not only because of its forceful aspect, but also as representative of the numerous riots and rebellions, in the capital and throughout the country, that P rier had vehemently quashed during his Premiership. During riots in Paris in late September 1831, P rier must truly have seemed to embody Ripa's Force of Eloquence, when he was himself forced from his carriage but bowed the crowd into letting him pass unharmed.⁴⁶

In light of P rier's particular brand of eloquence the attribute of Fortitude, represented wearing the skin of a lion and holding the branch of an oak, symbols of strength and steadfastness, seems appropriate. (ill. 111) Like the image of the clenched fist, that strength and steadfastness were in fact P rier's most recognized characteristics. On the day of his funeral Charles B ranger, the journalist, (1802-1860) qualified P rier as 'one of those men of strong character' and the Duc de Choiseuil claimed that 'his inflexible steadfastness never faltered under any circumstances'.⁴⁷ This image persisted for many years as in 1930, when Lucas-Debreton wrote P rier's biography, he entitled it *La Mani re forte de Casimir P rier et la R volution de 1830*. P rier's fortitude was also specifically seen as an instrumental aspect of maintaining the regime and in his eulogy, the Duc de Choiseuil pointed to it as the means of imposing peace and

⁴⁵Ripa, *Iconologia*, London, 1709, p. 32

⁴⁶Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. 63

⁴⁷*Moniteur Univerel*, No. 141, 20 May, 1832

stability upon the nation, claiming P rier's 'courageous fortitude' was responsible for avoiding war with the European powers ⁴⁸

While the allegorical representations of Eloquence and Fortitude may have represented the salient characteristics of P rier as an individual, the third allegorical figure of Justice, represented as a crowned woman, holding scales and a sword, seems more appropriate as a political virtue of a regime as a whole. (ill. 112) Yet, the conjoined role of the three allegorical figures on the monument is clarified by their similarity with allegories used to represent the Orleans Monarchy, establishing a reciprocal relationship between glorification of P rier's qualities and those of the regime he embodied. To begin with, the two pediments of the pavilions of the Palais Royal - traditional seat of the Orleans family - had been decorated in the Eighteenth century by Augustin Pajou (1730-1809) with figures representing *Justice*, *Strength*, *Prudence* and *Liberality*.⁴⁹ (ills. 113 and 114) More recently, in 1830, the Ministry of Commerce and Public Works had commissioned a series of sculptures for the Salle des S ances at the Palais Bourbon. Among these sculptures, three allegorical figures came directly from the Orleans coat of arms: *Justice* (ill. 115) by Augustin Dumont (1801-1884), *Strength* (ill. 116) by Louis Desprez (1799-1870) and *Prudence* (ill. 117) by Denis Foyatier (1793-1863). In addition, a figure of *Eloquence* (ill. 118) was commissioned from the sculptor A. Allier (1793-1870).⁵⁰ The figure of *Strength* at the Palais Bourbon and that of P rier's *Fortitude* are highly analogous, as both are draped with

⁴⁸*Moniteur Univerel*, No. 141, 20 May, 1832

⁴⁹*Justice, Force, Prudence et Lib ralit , Guide pittoresque du voyageur en France, Paris et ses environs*, Paris, 1835, p. 94

⁵⁰*Justice, Force, Prudence et  loquence*, Archives Nationales F²¹ 584

lion skins and carrying oak branches. (ills. 111 and 116) If by 1852, the juxtaposition of virtues on Pérrier's tomb seemed 'bizarre', it is in all likelihood due to the fact that viewers like Gastineau no longer saw the connection with this official political rhetoric. To the audiences of the 1830's however, the link between the virtues on Pérrier's tomb, those of the Palais Royal and those of the Palais Bourbon must have been quite apparent: Pérrier's tomb was begun only two years after the Palais Bourbon commissions, one year before the plaster models of Dumont's *Justice* and Desprez' *Force* were exhibited at the 1833 Salon. Moreover, the Orleans coat of arms would have been common knowledge, even apart from the ever-present visibility of the Palais Royal pediments.

The function of the monument as a glorification of official ideology rather than of the individual commemorated, is further emphasized by the selective manner in which Pérrier's own biography is presented. In particular, references to Pérrier's career as a prosperous and successful banker were completely omitted. In 1801, Casimir and his brother Antoine-Scipion had founded a bank, which thrived - especially during the Restoration - and made Casimir into one of the wealthiest bankers in France.⁵¹ Yet the inscription on the monument refers only to Pérrier's political career: 'Elected deputy seven times, President of the Council of Ministers under Louis-Philippe I. He eloquently and courageously defended order and liberty at home. Peace and national dignity abroad.'⁵² The statue of Pérrier is also

⁵¹*Biographie universelle (Michaud), ancienne et moderne*, vols. 1-45, Paris, 1843-, vol. 32, p. 490

⁵²'Sept fois élu député. Président du Conseil des ministres sous Louis Philippe I. Il défendit avec éloquence et courage l'ordre et la paix dans l'intérieur. La paix et la dignité nationale à l'extérieur.'

dressed in the robes of a deputy, and the drapery reveals only a modest view of the contemporary fashion underneath. In comparison to the Foy monument, Jacques de Caso has claimed that the use of the deputy's robes was a compromise in the debate between the use of classical or modern dress for monumental statuary and a progression towards the eventual preponderance of modern dress in both funerary and public monuments.⁵³ However, in this case the choice may be interpreted not only as being aesthetic, but political as well, for if the robes obscure the modern dress, they also obscure P rier's bourgeois banker's costume in favour of his political identity.

The disregard for P rier's financial career may in fact be interpreted as a careful obfuscation of a particularly criticized aspect of his political system and the Orleans regime. P rier's financial background was seen to emerge in his politics by the favour shown above all else to citizens of sufficient financial means, to the exclusion of both the traditional privileges afforded by birth and rank and of the working classes. Significantly, one of P rier's most resounding reforms in August 1831 divested the Chamber of Peers of its hereditary basis.⁵⁴ However, this was not necessarily an act based on the desire to create an equitable society, as at the other end of the social spectrum, the working classes were still denied the political reforms and universal suffrage promised by the republican element of the July Revolution. Instead, the privilege of political participation became securely based on financial status. In the past the peers had mostly been members of the nobility or high church officials such as bishops. The law of the 29

⁵³Jacques de Caso, *David d'Angers, L'avenir de la m moire*, Paris, 1988, p. 112

⁵⁴For abolition of hereditary privilege see Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. 62

December, 1831 granting the King the sole right of appointing peers, from what was still a limited pool, meant that potential candidates would not only include ministers, deputies with at least six years experience, highly placed government officials, academicians, property owners but also manufacturers and businessmen, of a certain age and experience in public office, who paid at least 3 000 francs in taxes.⁵⁵ The monarchy partially earned its sobriquet of 'bourgeois' as a result of this political system, where the bourgeoisie, empowered by their financial status now made up the largest proportion of the voters, causing the writer Stendhal (Henri Beyle 1783-1842) to claim that 'the bankers were at the heart of the state'.⁵⁶

As a result of his politics as well as his profession, Périier was perceived, by both the supporters and detractors of the regime, as being personally responsible for having maintained the stability, prosperity and property of the bourgeoisie, as both the embodiment and purveyor of bourgeois rule. At his funeral, the Chamber of Commerce paid homage to the man they saw as their very own champion, by stating that 'the Commerce of Paris is proud to have seen emerge from its midst the great citizen, who...established his administration as a foundation indispensable to the prosperity of commerce...'⁵⁷ Heinrich Heine may have characterized Périier as the 'Atlas who carries on his shoulders the *bourse*', but this was not meant

⁵⁵Charl  ty, *La Monarchie de Juillet*, Paris, 1921, p. 62

⁵⁶Cited in Theodore Zeldin, *Ambition and Love, France 1848-1945*, Oxford, 1980, p. 77

⁵⁷'Le commerce de Paris se glorifie d'avoir vu sortir de son sein le grand citoyen qui, plac      la t  te du Gouvernement, avait pris pour sa devise, *La Charte et la Paix*, et avait ainsi   tabli l'administration qu'il dirigeait sur ces bases indispensables    la prosp  rit   du commerce.' M. Fran  ois-Delessert, quoted in the *Constitutionnel*, No. 141, 20 Mai, 1832

to be a flattering association, for Heine felt that in order to raise the rates of the stock exchange, Périer had debased the nation.⁵⁸ 'Never' claimed he claimed, 'has France been so low in the esteem of foreigners, not even during the times of a Pompadour or a Dubarry. One realizes now that there is something even more contemptible than the reign of mistresses; one can find greater honour in the boudoir of a debauched woman than with a banker.'⁵⁹ The financial world of the bankers and the Bourse which were perceived as ruling the Orleans monarchy was tainted with an image of crass commercialism. More proof of the Bourse's overriding self-interest was given at Périer's own demise, for as Heinrich Heine claimed: 'The Bourse, should have at least for the sake of appearances, shown its affection with a small loss', but it remained impassive.⁶⁰ While numerous businesses were closed the day of Périer's funeral, the socialist journalist Louis Blanc (1811-1882) remarked that 'the Bourse, that dispassionate power, the Bourse is moved'.⁶¹ Under these circumstances, Périer's links with the bourgeois world of finance were not necessarily considered favourable for glorification on a monument which was ultimately representative of

⁵⁸Heinrich Heine, Paris, '27 May, 1832', *De la France*, VIII, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 12, 1980, p. 365

⁵⁹'Jamais la France n'a été aussi bas aux yeux de l'étranger, pas même dans le temps de la Pompadour et de la Dubarry. On s'aperçoit maintenant qu'il y a quelque chose de plus déplorable encore que le règne des maîtresses, on peut trouver plus d'honneur dans le boudoir d'une femme galante que dans le comptoir d'un banquier.' Quoted in Charléty, *La Monarchie de Juillet*, Paris, 1921, p. 80

⁶⁰Heinrich Heine, 'Paris, 27 May, 1832', *De la France*, VIII, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 12, 1980, p. 367. J. Lucas-Debreton claims the same sentiment was uttered in the *National* after the funeral. See *La Manière forte de Casimir Périer et la révolution de 1830*, Paris, 1929, p. 249

⁶¹'La Bourse, cet impassible pouvoir, la Bourse s'émeut.' Louis Blanc, *Histoire de Dix Ans*, vol. 3, 1844, p. 241

official political ideology and mention of his career as a banker was conveniently avoided.

The turmoil caused by the death of P rier in 1832 made a public monument a quasi political necessity, but the question of its placement was still to be resolved. In 1832, the grandiose public commemoration of a deceased Prime Minister would not have been all that unusual, since the Orleans regime was a Constitutional Monarchy, loosely based upon the English model of government, where in theory, the monarch was actually relegated to a secondary political role, while the real power would have been wielded by the Prime Minister. As such, one might expect commemoration of the Prime Minister to be equal to the importance of his position, a model already established by the English at Westminster Abbey. While originally a space devoted almost exclusively to the burial of members of the royal family and religious officials, Chaucer had been one of the first commoners and laymen to receive the honour of being laid to rest and commemorated in the Abbey in 1400 and by the Nineteenth Century, Prime Ministers were also receiving prominent monuments in the Abbey.⁶²

More novel was the recent incursion of the Prime Minister into the urban public space. A monument by Sir Richard Westmacott (1775-1856) had been erected to Prime Minister William Pitt (1759-1806) in the Abbey after his death, placed over the main doorway and depicting Pitt in the midst of oration. Furthermore, the former Prime Minister was also the recipient of a number of monuments in the public urban space, in Glasgow, Cambridge and London for example. These

⁶²John Physick, 'Introduction', *Westminster Abbey, The Monuments*, London, 1989, p. 10

were not government projects like the Abbey monument but largely organized by private groups and funded by public subscription, as was the P rier monument. Government involvement was limited to granting permission through the Office of Works. Two monuments in London emerged from a single subscription which had actually begun during Pitt's own lifetime. A seated statue by Westmacott was erected in 1815 in front of the National Debt Office-founded by Pitt- at 19 Old Jewry and a standing statue by Sir Francis Chantrey (1781-1841) was erected in Hanover Square in 1831 (ill. 119), only a year before P rier's death.⁶³ Pitt had already been dead nearly twenty years when Chantrey was approached again in 1825 to produce a second figure with the sum left over in the original subscription.⁶⁴ The Tories had remained very much the same as they had been under Pitt and with recent agitation provoked by the pressure for government reform, the erection of a statue to the symbolic leader was, as in the case of the P rier monument, a show of force, stability and endurance. In 1832, the very year of P rier's' death, another important public monument by Westmacott, was erected in London in honour of Prime Minister George Canning (1770-1827). Heinrich Heine had claimed that he, and others, had noticed that there was a great deal of similarity between the two men in both physical appearance and strength of character.⁶⁵ Yet, despite these similarities, despite these recent British examples of

⁶³John Blackwood, *London's Immortals, The Complete Outdoor Commemorative Statues*, London, 1989, pp. 170-173. Westmacott's statue in front of the National Debt Office is now in Cambridge in front of Pembroke College, which Pitt attended.

⁶⁴John Blackwood, *London's Immortals*, London, 1989, p. 173

⁶⁵Heinrich Heine, 'Paris, 1 May, 1832', *De la France*, IV, *S mtliche Werke*, vol. 12, 1980, p. 334

the public glorification of Prime Ministers, a similar prestigious urban public locale was not granted to the Périer monument.

It would be tempting to see this as the result of Louis-Philippe's own animosity towards Périer, for having limited his influence and power, however it is more likely that it was the result of the regime's policy in regards to public monuments in the urban space in general. Louis-Philippe did not impose his own image, or that of his family, upon the capital as Napoleon and the Bourbons (Ancien Regime and Restoration) had. Exceptionally, the death of the Duc d'Orléans in 1842 prompted plans for a public monument with a plan for a bronze equestrian statue by Carlos Marochetti (1805-1867) for the *cour carré* of the Louvre but the unfulfilled project was cut short by the events of 1848 and the statue departed with the royal family that year.⁶⁶ As a rule, commemorative practices during the period were generally conciliatory in nature. For example, the difficult problem of the Place de la Concorde, a pivotal site of commemoration in the past, was resolved by the erection of the relatively neutral image of an obelisk surrounded by representations of the cities and rivers of France. If anything the obelisk might call to mind the days of the Napoleonic Egyptian campaigns, which suited the Orléans regime's resurrection of the Emperor's image in the capital.

Public monuments in the capital were limited for the most part to historical figures, the most important being that of Napoleon, by Émile Seurre (1798-1858), returned to the top of the Vendôme column in 1833 and whose remains were retrieved from the island of Saint

⁶⁶June Hargrove, *Les Statues de Paris, La Représentation des Grands Hommes dans les rues et sur les places de Paris*, Paris, 1989, p. 77

Helena and immortalized in a magnificent tomb designed by Louis Visconti (1791-1853) and others at the Invalides. The erection of monuments to other rulers from the past served as counter-balance to the Emperor's figure, placing him amongst a continuum of French national history. In 1844 statues of Philippe-Auguste, by Dumont, and of Louis IX, by Antoine Etex (1808-1888), were placed on top of columns as well, in what is known today as the Place de la Nation and in the 1840's, a series of statues of the so-called 'Queens of France' were erected as well in the Luxemburg gardens.⁶⁷ Alternatively commemorative statuary concentrated on national figures of cultural, literary and religious prestige, such as Molière, with a fountain inaugurated in 1844 on the Rue Richelieu, designed by Visconti, incorporating a bronze figure of the actor by Bernard-Gabriel Seurre (1795-1867) and allegorical figures of *comédie sérieuse* and *comédie légère* by Pradier.⁶⁸ (ill. 120) In 1848 another fountain designed by Visconti for the place Saint-Sulpice was completed, commemorating four French clerics who were important as religious writers: Fénelon, Bossuet, Fléchier and Mabillon.⁶⁹ (ill. 121)

Individual monuments to contemporary figures, which were to become in the second half of the century an increasingly common site of the Parisian urban fabric, were an even less significant part of the July Monarchy's political agenda. Louis-Philippe's regime may have

⁶⁷For history of these projects see June Hargrove, *Les Statues de Paris*, Paris, 1989, pp. 76-81

⁶⁸See Philip Ward-Jackson's study, 'The Molière Fountain', *Antologia di Belle Arti, La Scultura, Studi in onore di Andrew S. Ciechanowiecki*, new series, Nos. 48-51, 1994, pp. 147-154

⁶⁹For a history of these projects see Béatrice Lamoitier, '1830-1848: L'essor de fontaines monumentales', *Paris et ses fontaines, de la Renaissance à nos jours*, Béatrice de Andia, ed., Paris, 1995, pp. 175-177

seemed more open to the public commemoration of contemporary meritorious individuals than its predecessor, being responsible for reinstatement of the civic commemorative function of the Pantheon on 26 August, 1830 and the organization of a vast project for creating a museum of French history, notable citizens and events, at Versailles. Nonetheless, these were both highly judicious pieces of self-serving political propaganda, since the transformation of the former Church of Sainte Geneviève was important as a demonstration of the prevailing mood of anti-clericalism and that of Versailles, palace of the Sun King Louis XIV, symbol of absolutism, distanced the liberal Orleans regime from that of the Bourbons. If at Versailles recent events, such as those of July 1830, and contemporary figures were glorified as the subject for many paintings destined for the historical gallery, it was an arena where the relationship with the viewing public could be carefully manipulated and controlled.⁷⁰ In contrast, in the capital's public urban spaces recent events were usually referred to obliquely, through the use of history and allegory, such as the events of July 1830, recounted on innumerable canvases, which were represented only by a disembodied allegorical form in the shape of a winged figure of Liberty on top of the July Column. The Pantheon's pediment, commissioned from David d'Angers in 1830 constituted an important exception which eventually demonstrated the problematic nature of glorifying contemporary or near contemporary individuals, with the presence of figures such as Jacques-Antoine Manuel (1775-1827) and the Marquis de La Fayette (1757-1834) on the pediment, who at the beginning of

⁷⁰See Michael Marrinan, *Painting Politics for Louis Philippe, Art and Ideology in Orleanist France, 1830-1848*, New Haven and London, 1988, pp. 57-66

the project had been allies of the regime, but by the time of its completion in 1837 were enemies of the increasingly conservative government.⁷¹ (ill. 122) Only one other monumental commemoration of a contemporary individual was erected during the course of the July Monarchy, exemplifying the regime's careful, if not fearful, attitude towards such an undertaking and shedding light on the significance of the location of the Pérrier monument as well.

Georges Cuvier (1773-1832), naturalist and founder of paleontology, died, though not of cholera, on the very same day as Casimir Pérrier. Louis Blanc characterized Cuvier as 'the glory of his century', but he concluded, the scientist's funeral was still not as spectacular as that of the statesman.⁷² This might lead us to believe that Cuvier was of no political interest and interpret the monuments dedicated to his memory as equally apolitical. The Government ordered a monumental statue of Cuvier from David d'Angers in 1838, but it was intended for a gallery in the Natural History Museum. (ill. 123) Another ostensibly 'benign' but more public, commemorative monument was erected between 1840 and 1846 in the form of a fountain near the Jardin des Plantes and the Natural History Museum by the architect Vigoureux, with figures by the sculptor Jean-Jacques Feuchère (1807-1852). (ill. 124) Yet, even the glorification of science was tainted with political associations. During the Restoration, a great debate between Cuvier and Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire had pitted the former's theory on the fixity of species against the latter's notion that

⁷¹For history of the Pantheon pediment see Neil McWilliam, 'David d'Angers and the Panthéon Commission: Politics and the Public under the July Monarchy', *Art History*, vol. 5, No. 4, December 1982, pp. 426-446

⁷²Louis Blanc, *Histoire de dix ans*, vol. 3, 1844, p. 241

species were constantly advancing. Saint-Hilaire's challenge had in fact largely been spurred on as part of a critique of the official institutionalization of science. Both Geoffroy's scientific account and the attack on official science were linked with radical political thought, exemplified by the affiliation of François-Vincent Raspail (1794-1874), scientist, doctor and journalist, with the movement. Raspail's republican activities under the July Monarchy resulted in his spending most of the period in prison. As a result, after 1830, the scientific debate took on new political meaning, with the supporters of Geoffroy symbolizing the regime's opposition and those of Cuvier, the establishment. This perception was enhanced by Cuvier's long-standing friendship with politicians such as Pierre-Paul Royer-Collard (1763-1845) and François-Pierre-Guillaume Guizot (1787-1874), members of a group of constitutional monarchists under the Restoration known as the *doctrinaires*, who emerged as conservative, pro-Pérrier politicians under the July Monarchy.⁷³

Erecting a monument to Cuvier was in effect as equally geared as the Pérrier monument towards substantiating the current regime's ideological stance, however, the veil of science may have been perceived as partially sufficient to conceal the politicized nature of the project. Since it was also a fountain, the functional aspect of the monument may have counterbalanced to a certain degree its panegyric character. Furthermore, in order to contain the potential volatility of the endeavour, the monument glorified through allegory and allusion alone as no likeness of Cuvier was actually included. The naturalist

⁷³For a history of the scientific debate and its political significance see Dorinda Outram, *Georges Cuvier, Vocation, Science and Authority in Post-Revolutionary France*, Manchester, 1984, especially Chapter 5.

was represented through the figure of Natural History, attributed to Jean-Jacques Feuchère (1807-1852), holding a tablet inscribed with a quote Cuvier had adopted from Virgil: 'Rerum cognoscere causas' (Know the reason of things), and surrounded by a veritable menagerie by the sculptor René-Jules Puteau.⁷⁴ The use of allegorical allusions used for the Cuvier monument, which had made it possible to erect a commemorative monument to a contemporary individual in the public spaces of the capital - in fact the only such monument- were impracticable in the case of the Périer monument, where so much of the political significance of the project rested on the figure of the Prime Minister himself. Therefore, given the political necessity of erecting a grandiose public statement glorifying Périer and the conflicting reluctance to erect individual monuments in the capital, the ambiguous character of Père Lachaise - public in its visibility and accessibility, yet private in its function - made the cemetery the best, the only place, indeed, the *juste milieu* for such a monument.

The history of the monument's position within the cemetery itself also displays a marked desire to reshape the traditional definition of the tomb to achieve a closer resemblance to the public urban monument. Originally, when the *Moniteur* announced the monument project on 21 May, 1832 a site in the cemetery 'next to his illustrious friend Foy' was suggested.⁷⁵ Certainly, after the Prime Minister's death, links between the two men were commonly promoted. Périer, like his friend Foy, had been posthumously made a Peer, and his name, wrote the *Moniteur*, was placed next to that of his worthy friend, the

⁷⁴Béatrice Lamoitier, '1830-1848...', *Paris et ses fontaines*, Béatrice de Andia, ed., Paris, 1995, pp. 175-176

⁷⁵'...à côté de son illustre ami Foy...', *Moniteur Universel*, No. 142, 21 Mai, 1832

illustrious Foy in the Chamber of Peers.⁷⁶ Since P rier's death, the two men had been officially held up as symbolic political allies. For example, the *Moniteur* claimed that P rier had been an 'ardent defender of liberty as long as the ruling power was oppressive, and became the firmest supporter of the ruling power when agitators threatened the cause of liberty. This too would have been General Foy's role, had he lived...'.⁷⁷ In 1833 when the Ministry of the Interior commissioned the statue of P rier for the Chamber of Deputies (ill. 109), a statue of Foy was also commissioned from Desprez and exhibited at the Salon in 1837, so that even their effigies would stand together in the same room.⁷⁸

The comparison of the two men was not however necessarily a judicious piece of propaganda, for allegations could be raised that P rier had in fact betrayed the principles that he and Foy had seemed to stand for under the Bourbon regime. To begin with, their attitudes towards the army seemed intrinsically opposed, for while Foy was remembered as a champion of Napoleonic veterans during the Restoration, P rier seemed bent on undermining France's glorious military history. Many Frenchmen were hoping to retrieve the glory of the Napoleonic Empire under a new regime that legitimized those events and many Napoleonic officials who now occupied high posts in the government wished to see the reversal of the defeat of 1814, but

⁷⁶*Moniteur Universel*, No. 141, 20 May, 1832

⁷⁷'..d fenseur ardent de la libert  tant que le pouvoir  tait oppresseur, il est devenu le plus ferme appui du poivoir quand on voulut rendre la libert  turbulante. C'e t  t  aussi le r le du g n ral Foy s'il avait v cu, s'il avait continu  de partager les travaux politiques de son digne ami, qui se plaisait tant   r p ter son nom.' *Moniteur Universel*, No. 138, 17 May 1832.

⁷⁸For commission of statues see Archives Nationales F²¹ 488

Pérrier was not interested in campaigns.⁷⁹ Instead he desired European disarmament, and peace, sometimes at humiliating costs.⁸⁰ To the frustration of the glory seekers, the July Monarchy largely adopted a policy of non-intervention in Europe and a strong alliance with Britain, the great rival of Napoleonic times.⁸¹

Ultimately, Pérrier's monument was not erected next to Foy's, perhaps in part for the reasons outline above, perhaps because there were no suitable sites to found next to the General's monument, or because the monument commission found a site of even greater symbolic resonance. Almost immediately following Pérrier's death, the city of Paris decided to contribute a plot for the erection of the monument.⁸² In the past the city had offered such a distinction on only rare occasions, for Delille and Brongniart for example. In this case though, apparently the commission in charge of the project was given permission to choose freely and they picked out what was probably the most valuable and prestigious site in the entire cemetery, namely the largest of Brongniart's coveted *ronds-points*.⁸³ (See Map 1) As discussed in Chapter Two, the architect had planned three of these for the cemetery, destined for monuments to individuals of great distinction and located at points of intersection between paths. Only two had been realized in the ultimate plan of the cemetery and both were still empty in 1832 at the time of Casimir Pérrier's death. They

⁷⁹Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, pp. 188-189

⁸⁰Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. 189

⁸¹Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. 187

⁸²*Moniteur Universel*, No. 142, 21 May, 1832

⁸³'La ville de Paris avait, du reste, laissé le choix du terrain à la commission chargée d'assurer l'empl de la souscription...' *Moniteur Universel*, No. 16, 16 January, 1837

were important focal points in the lay-out of the cemetery in pictorial, ideological and physical terms, which could, to a certain degree, be assimilated with the public square in urban planning and had probably, for this very reason, remained empty. So important were these sites, that, despite their initial generosity, the city commissioners may have regretted their hasty approval. By 1835, the political situation was transformed to the point that a strong public statement of P  rier's symbolic continuity was no longer necessary and the former Prime Minister was by now fast becoming yesterday's hero. In 1835, the President of the monument commission, S  guler was obliged to write to the Prefect of the Seine asking why the title to the plot had still not been transferred and why the office of the Prefecture were apparently now questioning the nature of the donation.⁸⁴

In their choice of location the commissioners had betrayed a desire to enhance the monument with as official an air as possible within the confines of the cemetery and to come as close to the character of a public urban monument as possible. Given the ever increasing numbers of visitors to the cemetery, as well as the guidebooks and engravings produced, the *rond-point* chosen for P  rier was a highly visible arena for monuments, situated as it was on the main circular carriage-way. As it was, it would have been difficult to circulate in the cemetery without coming across it, but in addition, the height of the monument was accentuated by its placement on a raised tumulus, so that it rose above the monuments below it and was visible

⁸⁴Paris, 7 March, 1835. Archives de la Seine 3AZ 310 Pi  ce 5

even from a great distance, supporting the *Moniteur's* assertion that it did indeed stand 'alone, as in the centre of a public square.'⁸⁵

This fast-paced transformation of the political atmosphere that gave meaning to P rier's statue may largely be seen as responsible for the loss of its status and intelligibility. The monument was an exceptional innovation not only as a rare instance of public, official July Monarchy commemoration of a contemporary figure but also as a precedent for the erection of official monuments in a cemetery. In the following years the practice was probably overshadowed by the growing number of urban public monuments in the capital but the revival at the end of the century of the cemetery as a locus for the dissemination of official propaganda may have been an attempt to escape what was by then the public's jaded reaction to what was perceived as an overabundance of public statuary.

When Adolphe Thiers (1797-1877) died, a national subscription was also launched for the erection of a monument in P re Lachaise, resulting in an enormous mausoleum located adjacent to the cemetery Chapel. Constructed in 1886 by the architect Alfred Philibert Aldrophe (1834-1895), the monument physically and symbolically overshadowed the chapel, which was originally intended as the central focus of the cemetery, placing it in a position as prominent as P rier's. (ill. 125) Thiers had become chief executive after the fall of Napoleon III and was responsible for negotiating the retreat of German forces from French territory in exchange for a financial settlement and also for crushing the Commune, symbolized by Henri Chapu's (1833-1891) relief of *Patriotism defending the flag held by the figure of France*. (ill.

⁸⁵*Moniteur Universel*, No. 17, 17 January, 1838

126) For the right, the figure of Thiers embodied the defeat of radical left-wing agitators and for the left he represented the enemy, and continues to do so today. While the left was holding annual commemorative services at the *Mur des Fédérés* - the wall where a large number of communards who took their final stand in the cemetery were executed - Thiers' monument balanced the cemetery's political focus with a prominent official monument.

In light of their strategic symbolism, it is not surprising to find that the second of Brogniart's *ronds-points* was also consecrated for official use with the erection in 1906 of a monument in the shape of an obelisk dedicated to the municipal workers of the city of Paris, who died in service, designed by the architect Jean Camille Formigé (1845-1926) and decorated with a statue of a female mourner by Denys-Pierre Puech (1854-1942). (ill. 127 and Map 1) This monument, like the Thiers mausoleum, was the offspring of a tradition begun decades before with the Périer monument, making use of the cemetery and the individual tomb for the propagation of official, nationalist and political ideas and serving to blur to an even greater extent the traditional division between the public and the private.

Chapter Six

Military Memorials 1815-1853: The Promotion of the Hero from the Cemetery to the City

Following the Restoration of the Bourbons there slowly emerged at Père Lachaise a gathering of military figures, for the most part composed of some of the most illustrious Napoleonic veterans, buried in close proximity on the eastern slope of the cemetery, which eventually became known as the *camp des braves*. (See Maps 1 and 2) Officially, there were no real precedents for military cemeteries, the first being established during the American Civil War.¹ The emergence of the military enclave at Père Lachaise was a conscious attempt to establish a locus of memory and identity to counter the threat of historical oblivion, but in the face of neglect and lack of recognition by the Restoration government, it was also an expression of anti-Bourbon sentiment, made possible by the ambiguously private, yet public character of the cemetery. The addition of Marshal Ney's unmarked tomb to the military enclave added even greater significance to the locale. The events of 1848 and the advent of the Second Empire breathed new life into the military memories preserved at Père Lachaise, and the erection of autonomous monuments to Napoleonic veterans in the capital, such as the statue of Marshal Ney by François Rude (1784-1855) inaugurated in 1852, transformed what had previously been a politically oppositional

¹John R. Gillis, 'Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship', *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. John R. Gillis, Princeton, 1994, p. 10

commemorative practice into an officially sanctioned one and transferred the site of public homage from the cemetery to the city.

Despite promises of general amnesty, after the Hundred Days, death sentences had been handed out. Some, were fortunate enough to escape, like Count Lavalette, thanks to the ruse of his wife switching clothes with him in prison. Lavalette eventually received a pardon in 1822, but others were not so lucky. In particular, a number of military figures including Marshal Ney, Colonel La Bédoyère and Generals Charton and Mouton-Duvernet, were condemned to execution. They were all popular figures, but La Bédoyère and Ney were perhaps the most popular of all and both were both buried in Père Lachaise. Marchant de Beaumont, author of a number of publications on Père Lachaise in the 1820's, claimed that their deaths were an important factor in the increased popularity of the cemetery as a place of burial.² The number of monuments de Beaumont claimed were erected in the first years after its opening in 1804 do seem low: 13 in 1804, 14 in 1805, 19 in 1806, 26 in 1807. They were however rising steadily: 51 in 1808, 66 in 1809, 176 in 1810, 96 in 1811 and 130 in 1812. The great jump seem to come in 1813 with 240 monuments and 509 in 1814.³ Marchant de Beaumont attributed this increasing popularity to the melancholy inspired by military defeats, the number of soldiers finding a final resting place at Père Lachaise and the spectacular funerals of Delille and Grétry in 1814.⁴ The theme of general romantic melancholy afflicting the nation and directing it towards Père Lachaise

²Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire du curieux dans le cimetière du Père Lachaise*, Paris, (Third edition), 1828, p. 45

³Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire du curieux*, Paris, 1828, pp. 43-44

⁴Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire du curieux*, Paris, 1828, p. 45

was again picked up by Richard in his 1830 publication, which included the claim that 'the tragic and horrifying deaths of La Bédoyère and Ney imperceptibly turned spirits towards melancholic ideas.'⁵ This romanticized interpretation of the impact of these events on the public has been maintained to this day in Antoinette Le Normand-Romain's *Mémoire de Marbre, La Sculpture funéraire en France 1804-1914*.⁶

The case of La Bédoyère seems to confirm these theories. Only twenty nine when he was executed on 19 August 1815 at the Plaine de Grenelle, his tomb reflects only a heart wrenching sense of personal, emotional loss with a simple stele, surmounted by an urn, decorated with a single small bas-relief of a classically draped female mourner, holding a small child in front of a draped urn surrounded by the fallen warrior's shield and sword.⁷ (ills. 128 and 129) The weeping woman and the funerary urn were popular conventions derived from antiquity and often used by Neoclassical-classical sculptors and famous examples such as Antonio Canova's (1757-1822) *Monument to the Margrave of Anspach*, (Speen, Berkshire, c. 1806) were transposed in a variety of forms onto tombs at Père Lachaise, including one of the earliest and most famous in the cemetery, that of the Dragoon Guillaume Lagrange (d. 1807, ill. 37). Like La Bédoyère's tomb, the bas-relief on the Dragoon's cenotaph was linked primarily to private emotions rather than any military or political significance, ultimately a monument to

⁵'...les morts tragiques et effroyantes de Labédoyère et du maréchal Ney tournèrent insensiblement les esprits vers les idées mélancholiques...' N. Richard, *Le Véritable conducteur au Père-Lachaise, Montrouge, Montparnasse et Vaugirard*, Paris, 1830, p. 55

⁶Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, *Mémoire de Marbre, La Sculpture funéraire en France 1804-1914*, Paris, 1995, p. 30

⁷For biography, see Pierre Larousse, *Dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle*, vols 1-17, Paris, 1864-1886, vol. 10, 1873, p. 6

filial loss rather than to military grandeur. The inscription, 'Homage of a tender mother to the memory of the best and most unfortunate of sons...', indicates that the classical mourner of the relief represents the dragoon's mother. Similarly, on the La Bédoyère monument the inscription reads 'Only the love of my son kept me alive', transforming the classical mourner into La Bédoyère's widow and the child, his son.⁸ As David d'Angers observed, years later: 'These are the regrets of a woman, it is her heart, not the bitterness of politics.'⁹ By eschewing the political, the strictly personal, familial character of the tomb could be easily assimilated into a cult of romantic melancholy, but if the execution of La Bédoyère could be said to evoke feelings of melancholy on account of his youth, his widow and his son, these were not the sentiments evoked by that of Ney, and an emphasis on the romantic obscures the public and political issues raised by these events and the way they were reflected at Père Lachaise.

The events and executions of 1815 generated meaning on a number of levels, including the expression of anti-Bourbon sentiment at Père Lachaise, the question of the appropriate form and place for the commemoration of Napoleonic military veterans, and the distinction between private and public, challenged in Ney's case by the Restoration's decision to 'censor' his tomb. The police had in fact placed both La Bédoyère and Ney's tombs under surveillance, followed visitors and even arrested two women for having placed flowers on them.¹⁰ As

⁸'Mon amour pour mon fils a pu seul me retenir à la vie.'

⁹'Voilà les regrets d'une femme, c'est son coeur, ce ne sont pas les aigreurs de la politique'. Quoted in Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, *Mémoire de Marbre*, Paris, 1995, p. 145, David d'Angers, *Les Carnets de David d'Angers*, ed. André Bruel, 2 vols., Paris, 1958, vol. 2, *Carnet 46*, 1847-48, p. 269

¹⁰Froment, *La Police dévoilée*, 3 vols., Paris, 1829, vol. 3, pp. 44-45

Napoleon wrote in his memoirs, 'pardoning Ney would have been proof of the government's strength and the moderation of the ruler', but instead the execution was 'yet another mistake', for 'from that moment on a martyr was created....'¹¹ The government had attempted to avoid this by switching Ney's execution from the Grenelle plain, where La Bédoyère had been executed, to the Observatoire location, in order to avoid spectators.¹² In similar secrecy, the Marshal's remains were quietly taken to Père Lachaise cemetery on the following day and placed in a tomb located close to the northern boundary of the cemetery, near Ney's father-in-law, Mr. Auguier.¹³ A simple headstone bearing only the name of the deceased and date of death was erected and depicted in anthologies such as *Le Champs du Repos, ou Le Cimetière Mont-Louis, dit du Père Lachaise*, Roger, father and son, of 1816 but early requests by the family to build a vault were refused by the Minister of Police.¹⁴ (ill. 130) The modesty of the tombstone, indicating nothing more than Ney's name, title and date of death, may therefore have been imposed by official censorship, but the measure proved insufficient as sometime between 1820 and 1821 the tomb was moved to the very eastern edge of the cemetery.¹⁵ In *Les Mausolées*

¹¹ *Les Grands procès de l'histoire*, ed. Claude Bertin, 7 vols., Paris, 1966-7, vol. 2, 1966, p. 316

¹² F. G. Hourtoulle, *Ney, le brave des braves*, Paris and Limoges, 1981, p. 215

¹³ See *Les Grands procès*, Paris, 1966, p. 317 and for location of tomb, C.-P Arnaud, *Receuil des tombeaux des quatre cimetières de Paris, avec leurs épitaphes et leurs inscriptions, (Père Lachaise, Montmartre, Vaugirard et Sainte Catherine dans le Faubourg Saint Michel)*, 2 vols., Paris, 1817-1825, vol. 2, 1825, p. 9

¹⁴ Louis Garros, *Ney, le Brave des Braves*, Paris, 1955, p. 284

¹⁵ For mention of the move see Richard, *Le Véritable conducteur au Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1830, p. 143 and Arnaud: 'À l'origine sa tombe se trouvait près du mur de clôture (v. plan)...Ce tombeau, et celui de son beau-père M. Auguier, administrateur général des postes étaient semblables. Ils ont été exhumés tous les deux et transporté au caveau de la famille qui est érigé sur le plateau où s'élève le

(1821) Jolimont claimed that the move was made in great secrecy and Richard, in *Le Véritable conducteur* (1830) maintained the secrecy was a security measure enforced by the police. Moreover, despite the law's assertion of the right of every individual to 'place upon the grave of a parent or friend a sign or a stone, without the need for authorization', with restrictions only on inscriptions, which were to be scrutinized and authorized by the Prefecture of the Seine, Ney's new tomb was denied any identifying mark whatsoever.¹⁶

Whereas the ambivalent private, yet public nature of Père Lachaise would at times enable it to be the locus of politically oppositional monuments, such as that of Foy, in Ney's case the situation was considered to be too volatile and in the interest of politics, the cemetery's private nature and the inalienable right of each individual to erect a monument to their loved one were transgressed. The original tombstone, in its bare simplicity, lack of text and decoration, could hardly have been more seditious than La Bédoyère's, therefore the reason for its eventual suppression must be found somewhere else. To

monument du maréchal Masséna, et sur la ligne où celui-ci se repose, ainsi que le Maréchal Lefebvre et d'autres braves de l'armée. *Receuil*, vol. 2, 1825, p. 9. However, on his map of the cemetery, which probably pre-dates the publication of the ~~second~~ volume in which the move is described, Arnaud still indicates the original location of the tomb. The tomb of Visconti, who died in 1818, also appears on the map. Therefore Ney's tomb was probably moved some time after 1818 and before the removal was mentioned by François-Gabriel-Théodore-Basset de Jolimont in *Les Mausolées Français, ou Receuil des tombeaux les plus remarquables, élevés dans les nouveaux cimetières de Paris, considérés sous le rapport de leur structure, de leurs épitaphes et des personnages qu'ils renferment*, Paris, 1821.

¹⁶For right of all individuals to place a marker on the grave see Imperial Decree 23 Prairial, year XII, (June 12, 1804). For restrictions on inscriptions, see *Règlement Général*, Article 14: 'dans l'intérêt du bon ordre et des convenances publiques, aucune inscription, épitaphe, ne pourra être mise ou gravée sur une croix, pierre tumulaire ou monument, qu'après avoir été revêtue du visa exigé par l'arrêté du 1er Juin, 1817, à cet effet chaque inscription sera préalablement présenté à la Préfecture de la Seine', Fait à Paris le 10 Avril, 1827. Printed in Richard, *Le Véritable conducteur*, Paris, 1830, p. 22

begin with, Ney's reputation singled him out as a symbolic figure, the epitome of Napoleonic military bravery and glory, a man who had been nicknamed by Napoleon after the battle of Friedland in 1807 as 'the bravest of the brave'.¹⁷ Throughout his career, Ney had demonstrated a fierce loyalty to the ordinary soldier, and while others had abandoned the bulk of the army, during the retreat from Russia in the winter of 1812-1813, it was Ney who sustained the debris.¹⁸ Moreover, Ney had been an *enfant du peuple*, whose origins differed little from that of the common soldier, and who had risen up through the ranks, in contrast with La Bédoyère's aristocratic background. For these reasons alone, there was cause to fear that Ney's tomb, more than any other, would become a site of pilgrimage, an excuse for illegal gatherings, meetings and the focus of seditious activity. The belated nature of the decision to make it anonymous was probably elicited by its association with just such unwelcome gatherings, feelings of malcontent and desires of revenge. Contemporary accounts recorded that the tomb had been constantly decorated with wreaths and flowers, indicating numerous visitors or pilgrims.¹⁹ Jolimont, claimed that the headstone had been the 'object of a fanatical cult' and 'covered with indecorous inscriptions', no doubt aimed at the Restoration regime.²⁰ Louis Garros in his biography of Ney, published in 1966, claimed that in

¹⁷*La Grande encyclopédie*, 31 vols., Paris, n.d., vol. 24, p. 1030

¹⁸*La Grande encyclopédie*, Paris, vol. 24, p. 1030

¹⁹See Arnaud: 'Le tombeau du maréchal était chaque jour orné de plusieurs couronnes. La terre enfermée dans une balustrade était incéssamment jonchée de fleurs et ombragée de lugubres cyprès.' *Receuil*, vol. 2, Paris, 1825, p. 9 and Jolimont, *Les Mausolées*, Paris, 1821

²⁰Jolimont, *Les Mausolées*, Paris, 1821

November of 1816 an officer of the hussars scratched a 'V' on the tomb, supposedly for Vengeance.²¹

Even if such stories are apocryphal, a number of popular prints point to the tomb as a potentially potent symbolic image of military loss and anti-Bourbon sentiment, stressing the strength of the feelings for Ney throughout the entire army, from the common soldier to the officers. In *Ils pleurent un compagnon d'armes* seven military figures representing a cross-section of various military units and ranks gather around to place laurel branches on a tomb dated 1815 which is surrounded by weeping willows.²² (ill. 131) To the far left, a cuirassier or dragoon bows his head in grief. To his right is a figure, holding a lance and wearing the distinctive square-topped lance cap or *czapka* worn by Polish cavalry lancers. In 1811, three Polish lancer units were added to the French Cavalry and two regiments of Polish lancers were part of the Imperial Guard's cavalry.²³ Next, two figures wear the bearskin caps of the Imperial Guard. The figure placing laurel branches on the tomb might be an officer. To the far right a young boy, identifiable as a drummer, by the distinctive outline of the instrument at his feet, weeps unashamedly on the tomb. It is possible that it was actually the circulation of such images, with their illustration of the tomb as a rallying point that brought the potential danger of Ney's tomb to the attention of the authorities and prompted its removal and enforced anonymity.

²¹*Les Grands procès de l'histoire*, ed. Claude Bertin, vol 2, 1966, p. 317

²²Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Estampes, Va. 334 vol. 6, XXth arrondissement (Microfilm H95912)

²³Philip J. Haythorthwaite, *The Napoleonic Source Book*, London, 1990, p.182

As it turns out, Ney's myth was actually enhanced by the harsh refusal of a marker. The secret of the move was not kept for long, and the tomb, enclosed by a railing and with no other distinguishing markers, soon became as renowned as any monumental tomb. Anthologies such as Jolimont's indicated the new location and other romantic engravings of an empty, overgrown plot surrounded by a railing were circulated. (ill. 132) Even though Ney's name was not inscribed upon a headstone, visitors are said to have etched his name over and over again on the bars of the railing itself.²⁴ Pilgrimage to the tomb became in itself an assertion of political belief for those like Julien in *Le Rouge et le noir*, with his nostalgia for Napoleonic times, causing the author Stendhal to remark on the 'wise policy of depriving it of the honour of an epitaph'.²⁵ Moreover, the neglected look of the site emphasized similarities with the general fate of the Napoleonic veterans under the Restoration.

After Waterloo Louis XVIII dismissed large numbers of soldiers, without proper severance pay or pensions and the neglect of these men who had risked their lives for their country became the subject of bitter resentment. Many of them had no other profession or resources to fall back on. Popular prints produced in 1815 after Waterloo repeatedly depicted the dejected soldier, on the road with no where to go and no means of making a living. The theme of the *soldat-laboureur* was popularized by caricatures, paintings such as Horace Vernet's *Peace and War (Le Soldat-laboureur)* of 1820 (ill. 133) - rejected from

²⁴Jolimont, *Les Mausolées*, Paris, 1821

²⁵'...le tombeau du maréchal Ney, qu'une politique savante prive de l'honneur d'une épitaphe.' Stendahl, *Le Rouge et le Noir*, Paris, (1830), Garnier-Flammarion, 1964 edition, p. 255

the Salon of 1822, supposedly for its anti-Bourbon content - in poems such as 'Le Soldat-laboureur' by Émile Dubraux and on the stage in an 1821 vaudeville of the same name, all illustrating the change in status these once heroic military figures had undergone.²⁶ The shared relationship with the land and soil of the nation was not only a socio-economic one, but a patriotic, political image as well, playing on the Emperor's popularity with the rural population and illustrated by images of the *Jardinier de Saint Hélène*, where Napoleon was depicted tilling his own garden.²⁷ As an *enfant du peuple*, the figure of Ney embodied these ideas and at least one of the many engravings of Ney's tomb appears to evoke the well-known theme of the *soldat-laboureur*, depicting the unmarked grave with no visible figures about, except for a wheelbarrow and an abandoned pick, highly reminiscent of Vernet's painting, and perhaps suggesting the absent *laboureur*, abandoned, neglected, and ignored like the Marshal himself in the barren tomb nearby. (ill. 134)

The tombs of La Bédoyère and the Dragoon, Guillaume Lagrange, were thus already psychologically more distant from the strong political messages generated by Ney's tomb, but they were also significantly spatially distant. The attempted anonymous displacement of Ney's tomb had in fact placed him in an area that was of even greater spatial significance by its proximity to other great Napoleonic military figures, such as Marshal Masséna (1756-1817),

²⁶Horace Vernet, *War and Peace*, Wallace Collection P598. The vaudeville 'Le Soldat Laboureur' was written by Francis, Brazier and Dumersan and is mentioned by Gérard de Puymège, 'Le Soldat Chauvin', in *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, ed. Pierre Nora, Paris, 1986, pp. 45-80.

²⁷Armand Dayot, *La Restauration: Louis XVIII à Charles X, d'après l' image du temps*, Paris, n.d., p. 134

who had recently been buried just a few yards away, and their proximity was in all probability not the result of pure coincidence. (Ill. 136) It is true that Ney and Masséna had had their differences during the Peninsular war²⁸, but denied any other form of recognition, their united front marked the beginning of the creation of an enclave of glory for former Napoleonic military figures. If Masséna had escaped the fate of his less fortunate comrades such as Ney and La Bédoyère, he was hardly a popular figure with the Restoration. Having retained his position as commander of the 8th Division under Louis XVIII in 1814, Masséna had also rallied to Napoleon's side during the Hundred Days and after the second Restoration he retired from public life.²⁹ After his death, the *Moniteur* nonetheless offered him a sympathetic obituary, glossing over his actions during the Hundred Days and going so far as to claim that only a long illness had prevented him from receiving the Marshal's baton from Louis XVIII.³⁰

According to the *Moniteur*, Masséna's funeral was carried out with all the pomp and ceremonies appropriate to his rank, his body being laid in state in Paris at the church of Saint Thomas Aquinas for several days and from there proceeding directly to Père Lachaise.³¹ However, something was definitely missing. In 1800 with the transfer of Turenne's remains from the Museum of French Monuments, Napoleon had transformed the Invalides from a place of worship into a

²⁸Haythorthwaite, *The Napoleonic Source Book*, London, 1990, p. 356

²⁹Pierre Larousse, *Dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle*, vol 10, Paris, 1873, p. 1312

³⁰*Moniteur Universel*, No. 96, 6 April, 1817 and No. 99, 9 April, 1817

³¹*Moniteur Universel*, No. 101, 11 April, 1817

heroic repository.³² Lucien Bonaparte had also dreamed of transforming the entire esplanade of the Invalides into a vast heroic military necropolis for those who had sacrificed their life for the Nation.³³ While this dream was never attained, the Invalides did become the site of grand heroic military commemoration with the addition of historical figures such as Vauban on 26 May 1808 and recent military figures such as General Leclerc who died in 1802 on the island of Tortuga after the unsuccessful campaign in S. Domingo, in 1810, Marshal Lannes, Duc de Montebello who died at Essling (or Aspern), and three victims of the Russian campaign of 1812, Generals Baraguay-d'Hilliers, Eblé and Conte Lariboisière, in February 1813.³⁴ Under Napoleon, Masséna might also have hoped for a brief stop at the Invalides for an appropriate ceremony, but the Restoration regime's attitude toward the use of the Invalides as a space of military glorification was not favourable as they regarded it as a possible source of sedition, filled as it was with disgruntled Napoleonic veterans. With only two notable exceptions, the military ceremonial at the Invalides instituted by Napoleon was not maintained and the first of these exceptions was probably geared more towards denting the Napoleonic legend than to glorifying a military figure.

On the 11 July, 1829 the heart of General Kléber was placed in the Invalides. Kléber's scintillating victories in Egypt, at Gaza, Jaffa and Mount-Thabor had made him a serious contender of Napoleon's and

³²Anne Muratori-Philip, *L'Hôtel des Invalides*, Paris, 1992, p. 72 and Auguste Solard, *Histoire de l'Hôtel royal des Invalides depuis sa fondation jusqu'à nos jours*, Paris, 1849, pp. 187-191

³³See Muratori-Philip, *L'Hôtel des Invalides*, 1992, p. 80 and Solard, *Histoire de l'Hôtel royal des invalides*, Paris, 1849, p. 230

³⁴It would seem that the custom was to preserve only the heart at the Invalides, as was the case for Vauban, Leclerc and Lannes.

aroused the latter's jealousy. When Napoleon left Egypt to seize the reins of power in Paris, Kléber accused him of abandoning a desperate position, leaving Kléber with only the debris of the army. Kléber negotiated for peace with the British, but given the unfavourable terms and demands that all the French be taken as prisoners, Kléber chose to fight, defeating the Turks at Heliopolis and putting down the revolt in Cairo.³⁵ The army greatly mourned Kléber's loss after his assassination in Egypt in 1800, which added to Napoleon's jealousy and rancour, and may have contributed to the fate of Kléber's remains, which lay discarded since 1801 in the infamous prison fortress, the Château d'If, until they were retrieved by Louis XVIII in 1818.³⁶ A subscription for a public monument in his native city, Strasbourg, was organized, but Restoration authorities soon opposed its erection in a public square and demanded the project be changed to a mausoleum destined for the cathedral.³⁷ The elaborately decorated sarcophagus by Castex was exhibited at the Salon of 1819 (No 1225). The extensive rehabilitation of Kléber by the Restoration seems odd at first, but as the letter Collaud wrote to the Minister of War reporting the location of Kléber's remains claimed, it was 'the moment to expiate the injustices of a power of which its victims are beyond the grave' and the motivation for the commemoration of Kléber appears to have been essentially geared

³⁵The content of some of Kléber's letters from Egypt, intercepted by the British, may have indicated that he was so disgusted with the present French government that he might even have been agreeable to participating in its overthrow. See Arthur Paget to Lord Grenville, 13 March, 1800, *Report on the Manuscripts of J. B. Fortescue, Esq., preserved at Dropmore*, vol. VI, London, 1908, pp. 161-162

³⁶For history see J. Lucas-Debreton, *Kléber, 1753-1800*, Paris, 1937, pp. 339-343, *La Grande Encyclopédie*, vol. 21, p. 561 and Larousse, *Dictionnaire*, vol. 9, 1873, p. 1223

³⁷ A full-scale statue by Philippe Grass was inaugurated in the place d'Armes at Strasbourg in 1840. Lucas-Debreton, *Kléber*, Paris, 1937, p. 344-5

towards highlighting the former Emperor's petty nature and base jealousy.³⁸

As for the second commemoration at the Invalides under the Restoration, it seems to have been imposed rather reluctantly. Gouvion Saint-Cyr had died on an island just off Hyerès in the Riviera, and his remains were transported back to France where a funeral ceremony was initially celebrated in his parish and Restoration authorities seem to have rather unwillingly agreed to Saint-Cyr's commemoration at the Invalides. The idea may have originated with a young officer, the son of one of Saint-Cyr's comrades, and with the family's approval the idea was eventually put before the King. The *Moniteur* had announced the arrival of Saint-Cyr's remains, near Paris on 27 March, 1830 but the ceremony at the Invalides was delayed until the 6 April and the press made much of this delay, insinuating that the king's permission for a celebration at the Invalides was not forthcoming, accusations that were quickly denied in the *Moniteur*.³⁹

Given these circumstances, for Masséna - a turncoat of the Hundred Days - and many others, the Invalides was out of the question. Marshal Sérurier (1742-1819) was perhaps one of the most cruelly thwarted, as he had been governor of the Invalides since 1804 and one of the honours traditionally reserved for the governors was burial in the Invalides, but Sérurier's attachment to the Empire and to Napoleon during the Hundred Days caused him to be replaced on the 27

³⁸'C'est le moment d'expier les injustices d'un pouvoir qui frappait ses victimes au-delà du tombeau.' Quoted in Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques, historiques et morales du Cimetière du Père-Lachaise, représentant ses aspects, ses sites, ses points de vues, les plus magnifiques, les scènes les plus touchantes...*, Paris, 1822, p. 212

³⁹*Moniteur Universel*, No. 86, 27 March 1830 and No. 99, 9 April, 1830

December, 1815, thereby depriving him of his right to a final resting place at the Invalides.⁴⁰ Therefore it was to Père Lachaise that his funeral procession went on 26 December, 1819, joining the ranks a few yards from Masséna, in what is today the 39th division. His tomb, designed by the architect Jacot⁴¹ and decorated by the sculptor Germain, lists military honours, such as the Grand Cross of the Order of St. Louis as well as the Legion of Honour, but there is no mention of his position as governor of the Invalides.⁴² (ill. 136)

Therefore, for many Napoleonic veterans, Père Lachaise may have offered the possibility of recreating Lucien Bonaparte's dream of a necropolis of glory by allowing for old comrades in arms to find a resting place in close proximity. The monumental obelisk decorating Masséna's tomb, situated on the circular carriage-way and at the crossroads of four intersecting paths emerged as the highly visible key-stone of the encampment, becoming one of the most important tombs at Père Lachaise and one of the most often reproduced in illustrations in guidebooks on Paris or Père Lachaise, often portraying military figures admiring the tomb, or in solemn meditation.⁴³ In 1819 the popular image even encroached upon the Salon, when a view by Antoine Pierron (1783- post 1836) of the tomb was exhibited (No. 900). It was during this period that the enclave slowly grew as other

⁴⁰*La Grande Encyclopédie*, vol. 29, p. 1086 and Solard, *Histoire de l'Hôtel royal des invalides*, Paris, 1849, p. 202-3

⁴¹Possibly Paul Jacot, 1798-1860

⁴²Jolimont, *Les Mausolées*, Paris, 1921. The cross now on the tomb was a later addition.

⁴³For example see *Paris and its Environs, Displayed in a Series of Picturesque Views from Original Drawings Taken expressively for this Work, Comprising Views on the seine, Churches, Palaces, Public Offices, Bridges, Aqueducts, Catacombs, Streets, Modern Improvements, etc.*, Augustus Welby Pugin et. al., vols. 1 and 2, London, 1829 and Paris, 1829-1831, vol. 2, p. 113

Napoleonic military figures passed away and its fame and importance became so great that Napoleon himself may have considered it as a possible site for his own burial.⁴⁴ In 1819, General Lamartillière (1732-1819) was buried in the quarter. The following year, Generals Collaud (1754-1819) and Dumuy (1751-1820) joined Masséna's rear flank⁴⁵; Admiral Decrès (1761-1820) and Marshal Lefèbvre (1755-1820), his left. Gathering behind Decrès were in 1821, Marshal de Beurnonville (1752-1821), veteran of Jemmapes and Valmy, nicknamed the 'French Ajax', with a tomb modestly surmounted by a metal cross⁴⁶ and in 1823, General L.J.B. Gouvion (1752-1823), with a modest headstone. In 1823 Marshal Davout (1770-1823) took his position to the right of Masséna and the ranks continued to grow during the remaining years of the Restoration. Notable inclusions were in 1826, Marshal Suchet, Duke d'Abuféra (1770-1826), with a tomb designed by Visconti and David d'Angers, in 1828, General Rutty (1777-1828) and in 1829, General Jacquet (1779-1829).⁴⁷

This gathering was not coincidental, rather the importance of proximity was consciously recognized and purposely developed. Marchant de Beaumont described a moving scene in one of his many guides to the cemetery, *Vues pittoresques, historiques et morales du Cimetière du Père-Lachaise, représentant ses aspects, ses sites, ses*

⁴⁴Quoted from Napoleon's Testament written at Saint Helena in Jacques Barozzi, *Guide des cimetières parisiens*, Paris, 1990, p. 63

⁴⁵Dumuy's simple black headstone was once situated behind Masséna. For Collaud and Dumny, see Richard, *Le Véritable conducteur*, Paris, 1830, p. 146

⁴⁶Minister and peer under Louis XVIII, whose tomb was near Bourcke according to Viennet, *Promenade philosophique au cimetière du Père La Chaise*, Paris, 1855, pp. 233-6

⁴⁷Jacquet's tomb was recently restored by the Association pour la Conservation des Monuments Napoléoniens.

points de vues, les plus magnifiques, les scènes les plus touchantes...., published in 1822, in which Marshal Lefèbvre, while attending Collaud's funeral in 1819, indicated his desire to be buried nearby:

'Lefèbvre, accompanied by his first *aide de camp*, and two old *grenadiers*,...who had once served under him and had become the guardians of the ashes of so many illustrious figures resting in this funereal site, paused in front of the pyramid under which are buried the remains of Masséna, and not without glory; he saw around him, resting in the dust, the greatest *capitaines*,...he meditates, stares at the ground, traces with his stick the site he chose himself for his final resting place...remember', he said, 'that if I die in Paris, I wish to be buried there, next to Masséna.'⁴⁸

The scene was illustrated with an engraving showing Lefèbvre pointing to the site with his stick. (ill. 137) Lefèbvre died in September of the following year and his tomb was indeed erected on the very site he stands on in the engraving, just to the right of Masséna. (ill. 138)

Whether the account is true matters little for its insertion in Marchant de Beaumont's popular guidebook, which was reprinted many times over the following years, meant that the idea of an intended, desired proximity and the notion of its prestige and honour was itself widely

⁴⁸"Lefèvre, accompagné de son premier aide-de-camp et de deux vieux grenadiers mutilés dans les combats, qui avaient autrefois servi sous ses ordres, devenus maintenant les gardiens de la cendre de tant de personnages illustres reposant dans ce lieu funéraire, il s'arrête devant la pyramide sous laquelle sont ensevelis les restes de Masséna et non sans gloire, voit autour de lui, couchés dans la poussière, les plus grands capitaines, une fosse ouverte pour recevoir le corps du général Collaud, dont on célébrait, dans ce moment même, le 11 novembre 1819, les obsèques...il se recueille, fixe la terre, trace avec sa canne le lieu qu'il choisit lui-même pour sa place dernière, se tourne vers son aide-de-camp...'souvenez-vous si je meurs à Paris, je veux être enterré là, près de Masséna. Nous vécûmes ensemble dans les camps, dans les combats, nos cendres doivent obtenir le même repos.' " Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques*, Paris, 1822, pp. 183-184

circulated and publicized. In addition, each funeral in the enclave served to remind people of the proximity of other Napoleonic paladins. For example, in 1819 as Baron Pamphile de Lacroix eulogized Sérurier at Père Lachaise, he bid him to take his place 'next to his illustrious companions in arms! Here lies the brave General Lamartillière...over there the immortal Masséna...'49 In 1820 at Lefèbvre's funeral, Marshal Mortier, duc de Trévise (1768-1835) called on the soul of the departed Marshal to 'observe how these veterans, comrades with whom you shared danger in the field of honour, surround your tomb...'50

It would be tempting as well to assign political significance to absences from the military encampment and one does find that some of those who 'betrayed' Ney and sentenced him to death are buried elsewhere. For example, Marshal Perignon (1794-1818), who remained faithful to the Restoration, organized the resistance against Napoleon's return from Elba and also voted for Ney's death, was not buried in the military enclave when he died in 1818.⁵¹ Instead, Perignon's headstone was erected just off the main avenue on the northern border of the cemetery, in what is today the 24th division and decorated with trophies sculpted in low relief by Jean-Baptiste-Louis Plantar (1790-1879).⁵² (ill. 139) Marshal Kellerman, Duke of Valmy (1735-1820), who had also voted against Ney, was buried in what is today the 30th

⁴⁹*Moniteur Universel*, No. 360, 26 and 27 December, 1819

⁵⁰'Duc de Dantzig!...voyez autour de votre tombe ces vieux guerriers, compagnons de vos dangers au champ d'honneur...' duc de Trévise, *Moniteur Universel*, No. 260, 16 September, 1820

⁵¹For a list of the voting see Dayot, *La Restauration*, n.d., p. 27

⁵²Maurice Rheims, *19th-century Sculpture*, trans. Robert E. Wolf, London, 1977, p. 333

division, overlooking the main circular carriage-way, the Avenue of Acacias, leading from the Casimir Périér round-a-bout, on the south-east end of the cemetery, however, these choices were not necessarily dictated by the desire to distance themselves from the *champ of the braves*, for at the time of Pérignon's death in 1818, the encampment was only beginning to take shape, and in Kellerman's case, he was buried next to his wife who had died in 1812. If anything, past differences, and the issue of Ney's death sentence which had once been an important divisive element and split the nation, seemed forgotten. Sérurier, Davout, Lamartillière and Beurnonville were all guilty of having voted for Ney's death, yet they all existed side by side in the camp with those who had remained ever faithful to the Napoleonic side. There does not in fact seem to have been any concrete effort to distance the 'unfaithful' from the camp of the brave and past differences were forgotten for the sake of creating a unified front.

The addition of the Spanish General François Ballesteros (1770-1832) directly behind Masséna gives a clue to what was one of the strongest unifying factors in the encampment. Ballesteros had actually fought against Napoleon, therefore what united him to the other members of the enclave was not specifically Imperial glory. One might interpret the gathering as a spiritual kinship among warriors, however, in 1823, Ballesteros had also commanded the Constitutional forces against the duc d'Angoulême, was forced to flee Spain when the liberals were defeated, and ended up in exile in Paris, where he died in 1832. Therefore, while the former Napoleonic heroes at Père Lachaise had once been his enemies, Ballesteros shared with them a pervasive anti-Bourbon viewpoint, a political opposition also clearly expressed through

iconography, as on the elaborate tomb of Admiral Decrès, who had been Minister of the Navy from 1801-1814 and also during the Hundred Days.

In many ways, the Admiral's tomb resembled those of his neighbours, decorated by the sculptor Louis-Parfait Merlieux (1796-1855) with four winged victories at the corners, holding laurel wreaths, reliefs of crests, the sword of honour awarded by the First Consul after the battle with the British Navy at Malta, and at the back, the inscription Anvers and Cherbourg recalling memorable battles.⁵³ However, in addition to this, Decrès tomb is significantly more elaborate in its references to the past, with its two bas-reliefs recounting two of the Admiral's most memorable feats: *The Towing of the 'Glorieux', Battle of the 12 April, 1782*, in which a young Decrès, in the midst of the Battle of the Saintes in the West Indies, where several ships from the French fleet had already succumbed to the British, saved the incapacitated *Glorieux* from imminent capture, by bringing a cable over to the ship, enabling a frigate to tow it to safety (ill. 140), and *The Combat of the Guillaume Tell, Malta 30 March, 1800*, in which Decrès heroically defended his ship against three English vessels, surrendering only after 9 hours of combat (ill. 141). Recent events had given these scenes and the particular nature of Decrès heroism added meaning, one which could be construed as a critique of the current Restoration regime.

Decrès' actions in both of the reliefs involved attempts to safeguard French vessels from capture by the enemy at almost any cost, whereas under the Bourbons, almost half the Napoleonic fleet

⁵³Jacques Hillairet, *Les 200 Cimetières du vieux Paris*, Paris, 1958, p. 331

located in Northern ports had been simply abandoned to the Allies. Moreover, the story of the low-ranking seaman rising to the heights of power and position through acts of heroism and individual merit highlighted the Restoration's displacement of 400 seasoned officers from the Navy to make way for often inexperienced émigrés.⁵⁴ The pitfalls of such a policy had all too well been proven by the shipwreck of the French frigate the *Medusa*, off the coast of West Africa in 1816. While officers filled the lifeboats, 149 passengers and members of the crew were forced to rely on a makeshift raft and by the time they were rescued there were only fifteen survivors who had undergone dreadful ordeals in order to survive, including incidents of cannibalism. The story was widely publicized not only because of its horrific nature, but also as a critique of the Bourbon regime, whose reorganization of the Navy was blamed for the much of the tragedy. To begin with there were allegations that the shipwreck had largely been due to the inexperience and ineptitude of the Bourbon appointed Captain. Secondly, ghastly allegations of misconduct by the officers were provoked by rumours that the raft had actually been cut loose from one of the lifeboats by the officers themselves. Despite accounts published by the raft survivors, the officers were acquitted, provoking more accusations of favouritism and corruption. At the Salon of 1819, Théodore Géricault's enormous painting of the *Raft of the Medusa* perpetuated the scandal's circulation, so that by the time Decrès died in 1820, the events were undoubtedly not forgotten. The acts of heroism Decrès had been famous for and which were chosen to adorn his tomb

⁵⁴For history of the Navy under the Restoration see Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, Paris, 1955 (1990 edition), p. 285

would have appeared as a stark contrast to the alleged cowardly behaviour of the Bourbon Navy officers, and the Admiral's courageous efforts to extend a lifeline to the *Glorieux* from the jolly boat could be perceived as the polar opposite of the act of setting the raft of the *Medusa* adrift from the officers' lifeboat. Moreover, while most of the tombs in the military enclave were erected privately, the Admiral's tomb was the result of a public subscription, one that may have been organized with a view to highlighting Bourbon corruption by contrast with Napoleonic heroism.

The necessity of a space for making anti-Bourbon statements may have ended with the fall of the Bourbons, but the encampment nonetheless continued to function as the site of anti-government expression, even under the succeeding July Monarchy, a regime which by all accounts seemed favourable towards Napoleonic military memories. The continued oppositional character of the encampment was perhaps best illustrated by the events surrounding the death of General Lamarque, who succumbed to cholera on 2 June 1832, just weeks after Casimir Périer. However, if Périer's funeral procession had been a show of Orleanist strength, the general's funeral on 5 June was organized as a gathering of fierce anti-Orleanist sentiment. So fierce indeed, that the procession, originally headed out of town in the direction of the chapel in the Landes chosen by the General for his final resting place, was rerouted towards the Place Vendôme and attempts were even made to carry the general to the Pantheon. The resulting clashes with official forces ended in the erection of barricades and rioting which spread across Paris and lasted for two days. Significantly, there were those who would have liked to see Lamarque buried near

Masséna, 'in the midst of the illustrious, completing the luminous display of national glory...' ⁵⁵. If in the past, this display of national glory had been intended as a belittlement of Bourbon military policy and achievement, in light of recent Orleanist international policy, the statement was equally relevant for the new regime. As Prime Minister Périer had adopted a policy of non-intervention in Europe, worked towards a strong alliance with Britain and maintaining peace at all cost, resulting in what was perceived as a humiliating situation for many Frenchmen who had hoped that with the Bourbons gone, the prestige and glory of the Empire might be retrieved.⁵⁶ Commemorating Lamarque in the encampment would have drawn attention to the contrast between former military glory and the current lackluster situation and to a certain degree the additions to the locale during the following years of the July Monarchy may be perceived in this context, such as that of Napoleon's surgeon, Dominique Larrey (1766-1842) in 1842, laid to rest amongst the soldiers he had treated on the battlefield. Napoleon had said he was 'the most virtuous man he had ever known' and the famous quote served as his epitaph on the simple pyramid which is his monument. In 1835, Marshal Mortier (1768-1835) - an officer who had once commanded the Imperial Guard and Napoleon's left flank at Friedland - Minister of War under Louis-Philippe 1834-5, was among the victims of the attempt on Louis-Philippe by Fieschi. Mortier and the other victims were celebrated at

⁵⁵'Le amis du général aurait bien désiré que son tombeau occupe une place auprès de ceux de Masséna...et que son ombre allât se grouper au milieu de ces illustres , pour rendre complet le faisceau de gloire national...' J.B.P., *Vie politique et militaire du Général Lamarque, suivi de détails sur ses funérailles et les troubles de Paris qui ont été le résultat*, Paris, 1832, p. 35

⁵⁶See Chapter 5 and Collingham, *The July Monarchy*, 1988, p. 187-189

the Invalides, but it was at Père Lachaise that the marshal was laid to rest in the same division as Masséna.⁵⁷

While anti-government sentiment and opposition politics had been instrumental in bringing together these military and naval heroes, the importance of the encampment as a locus of memory cannot be discounted. In his work on commemoration, memory and history, Pierre Nora has described what he calls *lieux de mémoire*, sites of memory, which he claims 'originate with the sense that there is no spontaneous memory, that we must deliberately create archives, maintain anniversaries, organize celebrations, pronounce eulogies, and notarize bills because such activities no longer occur naturally. The defense by certain minorities, of a privileged memory that has retreated to jealously protected enclaves in this sense intensely illuminate the truth of *lieux de mémoire* - that without commemorative vigilance, history would soon sweep them away. We buttress our identities upon such bastions, but if what they defended were not threatened, there would be no need to build them.'⁵⁸ There is little doubt that the achievements and honours of the figures who gathered at the encampment at Père Lachaise were being threatened by an encroaching oblivion, brought on not only by the political climate but also by the simple passage of time and the apprehension of this fate must have been an equally important motivating factor in seeking safety in numbers.

⁵⁷Muratori-Philip, *Les Grandes heures des Invalides*, Paris, 1989, p. 217-8 and Haythorthwaite, *The Napoleonic Source Book*, London, 1990, p. 348

⁵⁸Pierre Nora, 'Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*', *Representations*, No. 26, Spring 1989, p. 12

That apprehension was expressed as early as 1817 by Thiébauld in his bitter remark at Masséna's funeral: '...how can one not be struck by the futility of the endeavor, when one has to refresh the memory of events so profoundly engraved in the memory of contemporaries...' ⁵⁹ Elsewhere, there were other visible expressions of that same anxiety, demonstrated for example, by the appearance in 1818 of a series entitled *Les Fastes de la gloire, ou les braves recommandés à la postérité*, which claimed to be a 'Monument erected to the defenders of the nation' by a group of writers and military figures' writing in collaboration, with the object of 'perpetuating the memory of great leaders and brave soldiers. A multitude of scintillating acts, of particular bravery, of noble spirit and selflessness...' ⁶⁰ The fear, that the heroic deeds and lives of past warriors might recede from the collective memory which prompted this literary monument, was also the impetus for the creation at Père Lachaise of a concrete site of memory, ensuring in its own way, that the names and events of the past would live on, and that far into the future, passers-by might be reminded of them.

So attractive were the advantages of belonging to this encampment, that almost any inconvenience could be overcome. In 1833, the son of General Gobert, killed in Spain in 1808, died, having disinherited his own daughter in order to erect a monumental tomb to

⁵⁹*Moniteur Universel*, No. 102, 12 Avril, 1817

⁶⁰'*Les Fastes de la gloire* sont spécialement destinés à perpétuer le souvenir des grands capitaines et des braves soldats. Une multitude d'actions éclatantes, de traits particuliers de bravoure, de grandeur d'âme, de désintéressement...sont les élémens qui composent cet ouvrage...' *Les Fastes de la gloire ou Les Braves recommandés à la postérité* suivis d'un précis historique sur les guerres de la Révolution: Monument élevé au défenseurs de la Patrie, par une société d'hommes de lettres et de militaires, Tissot ed., , vols. 1-5, Paris, 1818-1822, vol. 1, 1818, p. v.

his father. Gobert's testament indicated the choice of David d'Angers for the monument, not only one of the finest sculptors of the day, but also one who was already responsible for several of the tombs in the *camp des braves*, including Decrès' and Suchet's.⁶¹ In contrast, as *L'Illustration* remarked upon the monument's completion in 1847, the site itself was hardly one of the best, situated as it is on the edge of a rather steep slope.⁶² Situated facing the rather narrow pathway, the spectator can hardly gain enough distance to appreciate the monument, and the steep slope behind it makes a circumferential view impossible, but the disadvantages were outweighed by its position in the camp, almost directly opposite Ney.

The desire to create a *lieu de mémoire* was also apparent in a subtle transformation in the style of the tombs over the years, as they became increasingly elaborate and decorative, with more emphasis on individuality and narrative through the use of historical reliefs and portraiture, betraying an increased concern with recalling and recording past events with greater clarity and accuracy. As specific military achievements dropped from the collective memory of a nation, they were conversely becoming increasingly visible and legible on the tombs themselves. A quick perusal of the encampment finds that most of the earlier tombs, erected between 1817 and 1819, are the least elaborate, with little or no sculptural decoration. Collaud's tomb, which has since disappeared, was described by contemporary accounts as a small black marble pyramid or obelisk, executed by one of Père

⁶¹Archives de l'Académie Française

⁶²A.J.D., 'Le Tombeau du Général Gobert au Père Lachaise, par M. David', *L'Illustration*, No. 233, 14 Août, 1847

Lachaise's own monumental masons, Schwind.⁶³ Despite being a common funerary form, the pyramid alone was not completely devoid of meaning for a military figure, giving rise to associations with the Egyptian campaigns and the obelisks brought back by Bonaparte, but these were vague and fluid associations rather than references to specific military accomplishments or deeds. General Dumuy had only a simple black marble headstone.⁶⁴ Others like Sérurier's and De La Martillière's were limited to the barest references to military honours, with coats of arms, swords and canons in bas-relief.⁶⁵

Masséna's tomb, in the shape of an obelisk, was only slightly more complex. Masséna's widow, rather than settling for a local artisan such as Schwind, commissioned some of the leading artists of the day for the tomb: the architect Vincent for the design, Bosio for a portrait bust in relief and Théodore Napoléon Jacques (1804-1876), a student of Cartellier and Cortot, for the rest of the sculptural decoration.⁶⁶ The ubiquitous laurel and oak wreaths signify strength and glory, bas-reliefs of Masséna's arms and trophies, including swords and two marshal's batons - received from both Napoleon and Louis XVIII - surround his portrait and decorate the base of the monument. For those whose memory was feeble, explicit reference to Masséna's victories were inscribed on the front of the obelisk: Rivoli, Zurich, Gênes and Essling.

⁶³See Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques*, Paris, 1822, p. 212-5 and Richard, *Le Véritable conducteur*, Paris, 1830, p. 146

⁶⁴Richard, *Le Véritable conducteur*, Paris, 1830, p. 146

⁶⁵See Jolimont, *Les Mausolées*, Paris, 1821

⁶⁶Jolimont, *Les Mausolées*, Paris, 1821. For information on Jacques see Stanislas Lami, *Dictionnaire des sculpteurs de l'école française au dix-neuvième siècle*, vols. 1-4, Paris, 1914-1921, vol. 2, 1819 p. 196 or Ulrich Theme, Felix Becker, *Allgemeine Lexicon der Bildenden Künstler*, 37 vols., Leipzig, 1949, vol. 18, p. 308

It is only with Decrès' tomb that the elaborate historical bas-relief, recounting specific events and actions, appears. In part, this appearance may be due to the fact that there were funds available through the public subscription and the desire to make a specific political commentary about Bourbon policy in regards to the Navy, as discussed above. However, Decrès' actions were also exactly the kind that were the most threatened by the collective memory, for while the memory of battles might be written up in history books and sustained for generations to come, individual deeds of bravery were less likely to be recorded and thereby enabled to survive. In 1818, *Les Fastes de la gloire* had been partially founded on this very principle, dedicated as it was to perpetuating great acts of bravery, selflessness etc., which it claimed 'the historian abandoned to an unreliable tradition'.⁶⁷

Moreover, there was a great deal of popular romantic appeal to be found in Decrès' actions and the specificity of their illustration was mirrored by the length to which many of the cemetery guidebooks went to give detailed explanations of the reliefs.⁶⁸

It is not surprising that the most elaborate narrative reliefs appeared on a monument erected posthumously to General Gobert, on his son, Napoleon Gobert's instructions, at a time when the events described were many years in the past and were most susceptible to disappearing from memory. (ill. 142) Napoleon Gobert had gone to Spain in order to visit his father's tomb and it was during this trip that he lost his mother. Disagreements with his family may have launched

⁶⁷'Une multitude d'actons éclatantes...que l'historien abandonne à une tradition peu fidèle...' *Les Fastes de la gloire ou Les Braves recommandés à la postérité*, vol. I, 1818, p.v

⁶⁸For example see Richard, *Le Vérable conducteur*, Paris, 1830, p. 146 and Viennet, *Promenade philosophique*, Paris, 1855, p. 233

him on another trip to Egypt, where he succumbed to fever in 1833. His testament disinherited his own daughter in order to leave substantial amounts to the Institut for awarding prizes for works on French History. 200,000 FF were also entrusted to the Institut for the erection of a monument to his father.⁶⁹

Napoleon Gobert had been very specific about the commission of a monument for Père Lachaise to house his father's heart, not only by specifying his choice of sculptor, but also the format, which was to include the equestrian statue of the dying General and three narrative bas-reliefs.⁷⁰ David d'Angers' liberal and republican political sympathies were well known and he would have seemed the ideal choice for a monument to commemorate a Napoleonic General. Napoleon Gobert may have been inspired by the visit to his father's tomb in Spain to have the idea of erecting a monument to his father in France, but the mood in France after 1830 in relation to all Napoleonic also gave legitimacy to this idea, made particularly appropriate in light of the July Monarchy's rehabilitation of the Napoleonic legend, returning the little corporal to the top of the Vendôme column, orchestrating the triumphal return of his ashes to Paris and the erection of a monumental tomb in the Invalides. General Gobert's career also fitted perfectly into the Napoleonic legend, with his bravery earning him a quick rise through the military ranks, from a sous-lieutenant in 1790 to a general only nine years later.⁷¹

⁶⁹For biographical information see Larousse, *Dictionnaire*, vol. 8, 1872, p. 1336 and *Biographie universelle (Michaud), ancienne et moderne*, vols. 1-45, Paris, 1843-, vol. 17, p. 3

⁷⁰Archives de l'Académie Française

⁷¹Larousse, *Dictionnaire*, vol. 8, 1872, p. 1336

By 1833 however the heroic events of Gobert's military career and his death in 1808 would have faded from the general public's memory, almost demanding an elaborate narrative for the tomb. Napoleon Gobert had personally insisted on three bas-reliefs for the monument and typically, these illustrate the most important events in the General's career. The relief on the front of the base depicts the battle of Vicoigne and General Dampierre, entrusting Gobert with gathering the remains of his army and with his battle sabre. (ill. 143 and 144) On the right side an event which took place in Santo Domingo in 1802 is illustrated, in which, natives having locked their prisoners in a house and arranged to blow it up, are interrupted by Gobert, who is depicted killing the sentinel at the very moment he is about to light the fuse. (ill. 145) At the rear of the base, an incident from Gobert's Italian campaign is depicted, in which the General put down an uprising in Bologna in 1801. (ill. 146) Despite having been advised simply to open fire on the insurgents, Gobert had managed to parley with them and convince them to put down their arms without the use of military force. The addition of a fourth relief, replacing an inscription, on the left hand side of the base was David's own idea, depicting the death of Napoleon Gobert himself, in Egypt, as he entrusts the testament which ordered the monument to a friend who is returning to France. (ill. 147) Not only are the events depicted of a sensational nature, but the manner in which David 'related' them was aimed at achieving maximum popular appeal.

In a lengthy article on David the year of his death in 1856, the critic Gustave Planche claimed that David's departure from the ideal and linear harmony were the result of his desire to popularize

sculpture.⁷² As Jacques de Caso has pointed out in his monograph on David, this desire demonstrated itself in a tendency during this period to reject the accepted canon of ideal proportions for the human body, traditionally based on those established by antique sculpture.

Sculptors oscillated between depicting the body as seven and a half to nine times the length of the head and David's proportions are often closer to that of five to one, as they are on the Gobert monument.⁷³ The effect of these unorthodox proportions resembles that of popular imagery such as Epinal prints, where the emphasis given to the head allows for a more clearly defined facial expression. As a result, it was possible to make the events depicted more understandable on their own, without recourse to a written explanation. David's technique therefore imbued the Gobert monument with a certain public character, not simply by its location in an accessible space, but by its the ability to impress a wide audience with a legible text.

This emphasis on expressive heads, which may have seemed exaggerated to contemporaries when applied to sculpture was also important in adding a sensationalism to the reliefs that was part of their popular appeal. In the battle scenes in particular, highly energetic and at times savage expressions were made clearly visible even on such a small scale. Eye-catching moments included a native sinking his teeth into the leg of a French soldier directly behind General Gobert in the Santo Domingo relief, while another native digs his hands into a soldier's face. (ill. 148) These details intensified the action and

⁷²'...dans son désir de populariser la sculpture, il s'éloignait chaque jour d'avantage de l'idéal et de l'harmonie linéaire dont son art ne saurait passer.' Gustave Planche, 'Peintres et sculpteurs modernes de la France', *Revue des deux mondes*, March, 1856

⁷³Jacques de Caso, *David d'Angers: L'Avenir de la mémoire*, Paris, 1988, p. 161

also served to oppose the natives' cruder means of defense in comparison to the modern firearms of the French, which paralleled the theme and pathos of the main equestrian group and the Spaniard's lone attempt against Gobert. In addition David strayed from the ideal in his use of a shifting perspective in some reliefs, creating alternate horizon lines, instilling not only an appropriate sense of confusion, disorder and panic of battle, but also allowing a number of vignettes depicting separate actions to co-exist on separate planes and be read one at a time. For example, in the Santo Domingo relief, the architectural detail of the building holding the captives is displayed on the first plane as an essential element of the narrative. (ill. 145) The principal action, is depicted immediately to the left, with General Gobert slaying the native about to set light to the house. His torch, still in hand, falls dangerously close to the powder keg below the house, dramatizing the catastrophe so narrowly avoided thanks to the General's quick action. The rest of the subsidiary action all around the General is literally squeezed in, to the very limits of the frame, in all directions: bodies lie prostrate on the floor, filling every inch of foreground and the struggle between one soldier and native on the very right conveniently fills in the corner neatly by their position, which forms a right-angle.

In the scene at Bologna, while adopting a more conventional approach to perspective, composition is still organized in a manner that articulated and clarified the narrative. (ill. 146) The two opposite camps are clearly divided both physically and stylistically, with the figure of Gobert in the middle, his back to the army and facing the mob. The mass of the army behind Gobert, appears in orderly fashion, with its repetitive bayonets and cannon, almost all perfectly parallel, and

acts as a counterfoil to the disorderly group of Italian insurgents, turning writhing, twisting, wildly waving sabers, guns, hatchets and even a hat. The homogeneous appearance of the French forces is furthered by their uniforms, while the mob opposite them wears what are identifiable as local costume, but in a variety of styles. Even the facial features of the army are repetitive, all their mustached faces, equally impassive, while the mob is differentiated by more distinctive, variegated and expressive features. In addition, a pregnant space between Gobert and what seems to be the leader of the mob highlights their difference yet again. Gobert's contra-posto stance, leaning slightly back, contrasts with the insurgent leader's movement in the opposite direction, leaning slightly forward towards the mob, swayed it seems, by the strength of Gobert's words alone and repelled by the force of his very presence.

The expressive nature of the bas-reliefs was reiterated in the main equestrian group above, depicting Gobert falling off his horse as he is mortally wounded by a Spaniard at Baylen in 1808. (Ill. 149) Shortly after its unveiling *L'Illustration*'s critic reviewed the monument: 'this animated group, this impassioned struggle, this ardent and tumultuous episode seems, in my opinion at least, misplaced in this sanctuary of eternal rest.' The bas-reliefs could recall the agitated scenes of life, but the crowning figures must be composed of 'calm lines' that would not contradict the somber idea and the meditation of death.⁷⁴ Planche was of the same opinion in 1856:

⁷⁴'Mais le groupe animé, cette lutte passionnée, cet épisode ardent et tumultueux semble, à mon avis du moins, déplacé dans cet asile du repos éternel.' A.J.D., 'Le Tombeau du Général Gobert', *L'Illustration*, No. 233, 14 August, 1847, pp. 373-4

'When one is consecrating the memory of the dead, the wisest course is to offer their image in a simple and calm attitude; it is in the bas-reliefs that one should retrace the principle episodes of their life.'⁷⁵

This was a formula that in the past David had promoted himself, in his notebooks, and in his work, such as the Foy monument. Within this format, portraiture's traditional role was limited to the perpetuation of an image, naturalistic or idealized, of the deceased and it was the one most widely used in the camp, albeit in a variety of forms. Some tombs relied on portraiture alone for meaning, while others combined them with symbolic or allegorical decoration, or narrative bas-reliefs. The tombs of Generals Ruty (d.1828, ill. 150a) and Ballesteros (d. 1833, ill. 150b) consist of short columns supporting bronze portrait busts by Guillard and Théophile Bra (1797-1863) respectively. Portrait medallions were used by Bosio on Masséna's tomb (d. 1819) and by David himself on Marshal Suchet's (d.1826). For Marshal Lefèbvre (d.1820), David used a relief portrait in profile. In each case, the function of portraiture was strictly separate from any action or narrative process, whereas in the Gobert monument, David had collapsed the function of the calm, simple portrait, and the active, energetic narrative relief, into one.

Part of the problem may have been that Napoleon Gobert had specified the inclusion of an equestrian figure of his father at the moment of his death. Nonetheless, David could indeed have complied with Napoleon Gobert's wishes without transgressing what the critics

⁷⁵'Quand il s'agit de consacrer la mémoire des morts, le plus sage est de nous offrir leur image dans une attitude simple et calme; c'est dans les bas-reliefs du piédestal qu'il faut retracer les principaux épisodes de leur vie.' Planche, 'Peintres et sculpteurs', *Revue des deux mondes*, March, 1856

saw as the rules of composition for funeral monuments, by conforming to a more acceptable, calm depiction of the popular motif of the expiring hero. According to Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, David was inspired by a number of works, including a funerary antique stele from the Albani collection David had sketched while in Rome, monuments commemorating Desaix and particularly Chinard's unfinished group for the unrealized project of a monument to Desaix in Clermont-Ferrand (1801-1813), which he mentions in his journals.⁷⁶ However, the rearing horses on both the antique stele (ill. 151) and the Chinard (ill. 152) represent the expiring hero already dismounted, on the ground and particularly in the case of the Chinard, in a languid pose clearly derived from depictions of the Deposition. Much the same can be said of the influence of Westmacott's *Abercromby Monument*. - previously noted by Marie Busco - which David would have seen while visiting London in 1828, when he recorded his impression of some of the monuments he saw in Saint Paul's.⁷⁷ (ill. 153) While the expiring rider on the *Abercromby*, like the *Gobert*, is still barely mounted on the horse, the London monument also lacks much of the energy and expression David imbued the *Gobert* group with. David seems to have gleaned that energy from an entirely different source, hitherto ignored by historians, and one that was not at all funereal in nature, but even more obviously public. Rather, the ferocity of the Spaniard's attack and the violent reaction of the rearing horse was closer to the German

⁷⁶Le Normand-Romain, *Mémoire de Marbre*, 1995, p. 231

⁷⁷For Saint Paul's visit see *Les Carnets de David d'Angers*, ed. André Bruel, vol. 1, p. 7. The similarity between David's *Gobert* and the *Abercromby* has also been pointed out by Marie Busco, *Sir Richard Westmacott, Sculptor, Sculptor*, Cambridge, 1994, p. 35-37

sculptor, August Kiss' (1802-1865) *Mounted Amazon Attacked by a Panther*. (ill. 154)

David was acquainted with Kiss' teacher Christian Daniel Rauch (1777-1857)⁷⁸ and it is highly likely that he was familiar with the *Amazon*. In July 1837, David wrote to Rauch of his plans to start working on the plaster models for the Gobert project the following winter and his plans to go to Italy to execute it the following spring. In August 1838, Rauch wrote to David from Berlin about Kiss and the piece he was working on: 'a colossal group representing an Amazon on horseback battling with a leopard...', claiming that the successful execution was due in part to the study of local horseflesh and that David would be wise to do the same for he would surely find nothing as superb in Italy than the examples to be found around Paris.⁷⁹ A life-size model of the *Amazon* made a spectacular debut in 1837 and after being re-exhibited in 1839 was cast in bronze and placed on the steps of the Altes Museum in Berlin by 1841.⁸⁰ The influence on David is most clearly demonstrated in the position of the attacking Spaniard on the Gobert. Whereas sketches show the Spaniard pinned almost directly underneath the belly of the horse (ill. 155), much like the dead figure under the *Abercromby*, the final version has the Spaniard lunging much more dramatically at the horse's neck, in the same manner as the leopard attacks the Amazon on Kiss' group.⁸⁰

The transfer of such an idea to the Père Lachaise was not without problems and resulted in harsh criticism, not because the energetic

⁷⁸Rauch to David, 13 August, 1838, *David d'Angers et ses relations littéraires, correspondance du maître*, ed. Henri Jouin, Paris, 1890, p. 124

⁷⁹H. W. Janson, *Nineteenth-Century Sculpture*, London, 1985, pp 93-94

⁸⁰Drawings, Gobert, Album II, Musée David d'Angers

narrative was unsuccessful, but simply because it was considered to be out of place. As Planche commented 'This energetic action...would be understandable, it would be admired in a public square.'⁸¹ The innovative aspect of the Gobert monument which perplexed its contemporaries was precisely that it crossed over the boundaries between the funerary and the public monument, combining iconographic and stylistic elements from both and creating a new genre. The figure of the expiring hero was clearly derived from funerary imagery such as the *Abercromby* and David's own *Bonchamps* memorial and the format of a full-scale figure surmounting biographical bas-reliefs was one David had already used in funerary monuments, but, it was also one he had adopted for public monuments. The public character of the *Gobert* monument is made clearer by a comparison with another commission David was working on at the same time: the Monument to Dominique Larrey for the Val-de-Grâce, whose bronze full-length portrait statue and historical bas-reliefs bear the same idiosyncratic anatomical canon of proportions as the *Gobert*. (ill. 156)

David was Larrey's son, Hippolyte's choice, probably as a result of the sculptor's political stance as well as his talent.⁸² Having already worked on a number of monuments commemorating Napoleonic military figures such as those of Marshals Suchet and Lefèbvre, as well as currently occupied with the *Gobert*, he would have seemed a logical choice. David depicted Larrey, dramatically wrapped in his military

⁸¹'Cette action énérgique n'est pas à sa place. Elle se comprendrait, elle serait admirée sur une place publique.' Gustave Planche, 'Peintres et sculpteur modernes', *Revue des deux mondes*, Mars 1856

⁸²Viviane Huchard, *Galerie David d'Angers*, Angers, 1989, p. 57

cloak, clutching the Emperor's testament in one hand and reaching with the other towards his medical instruments, balanced on an upright cannon, inscribed with a list of battles alluding to Larrey's heroic work in tending the wounded on the battlefield, already immortalized by Gros in *Napoleon at Eylau* (1808). At the feet of his statue David placed a broken sword and a cannon ball embedded in the pedestal, as if it were the very ground of a battlefield. (ill. 157) For the four bas-reliefs around the base depicting the battle scenes of *Austerlitz*, *Beresina*, *Pyramides* and *Somo-Sierra*, David used the same style as that of the *Gobert* monument, with overlapping, prostrate, writhing figures, squeezed into the very recesses of the frame and popularizing moments of dramatic action, such as in the detail of a Spanish soldier biting into the neck of a French soldier in *Somo Sierra* (ill. 158), a style, which, in Jacques de Caso's words, produced 'a brutal, naïve vision, ...whose simplicity must strike the eye and the memory...of which the illiterate child and the proletariat must understand the conventions'.⁸³

Larrey, who had died in 1842, was also buried in the *camp des braves*, under a modest pyramid at Père Lachaise, only a few feet away from the Gobert monument. (ill. 159) The only inscription quotes Napoleon's testament (held by Larrey in the Val-de-Grâce monument) in which Napoleon described the surgeon as 'the most virtuous man I have ever known'. In Larrey's case, the funerary and the more public monument were separate entities, with the Val-de-Grâce monument fulfilling the task of recounting the memory of his achievements to the public, and the funerary monument maintaining a more traditional format. The existence of the two separate monuments

⁸³'Vision brutale, naïve...dont la simplicité doit frapper l'oeuil et la mémoire...dont l'enfant, l'illettré, le prolétaire doivent comprendre les conventions...' Jacques de Caso, *David d'Angers*, Paris, 1988, p. 162

also seems to indicate that a marginalized figure had been rehabilitated, that a promotion from the cemetery to the city, had taken place, but the *Larrey* was not an official public monument. It was the result of a public subscription and while visible to the public, it was nonetheless intended for a private space, in the Val-de Grâce. Moreover, although completed in 1846, due to political tensions it was not inaugurated until 1850. The first promotion from the *camp des braves* to the public arena was only attained in 1853, with the inauguration of a monument, erected by government decree, funded by a public subscription and located on the public thoroughfare, to Marshal Ney. It was also significant as an example of individual glorification of a purely honourific nature -as opposed to the functional nature of the fountains to Cuvier and Molière erected under the July Monarchy, or what Agulhon has called the 'history of urban decor', a decorative solution to an empty or strategic urban space - which was still largely an unchallenged royal prerogative in the Parisian urban space.⁸⁴

As discussed in Chapter Three, the first non-royal figure commemorated in the public Parisian space had also been a contemporary military figure, General Desaix, who had died 14 June, 1800 at the battle of Marengo, but new political considerations, soon prompted Baron Vivant Denon's (1747-1825, Director of Museums 1804-1815) to query as to whether it was even 'acceptable that the statue of a general occupy a public square in this capital? Should not

⁸⁴The site had been chosen because it was the spot where Ney had been executed and if anything it was an awkward location for a monument. See Agulhon, 'La Stauomanie et l'histoire', *Histoire vagabonde*, I, *Ethnologie et politique dans la France contemporaine*, Paris, 1988, p. 138

this honour be reserved for the Ruler and the Trophies consecrating his victory and power?'⁸⁵ While in 1800 when the monument was conceived the notion of Desaix as an embodiment of his own merited and earned military honours might still have been acceptable, by the time it was unveiled in 1810, an increasingly autocratic regime was in place, making displacement of prestige and honour unacceptable and no other such autonomous commemorative monuments to illustrious or meritorious individuals were erected in the capital for almost half a century.

The project for a monument to Ney was not however simply due to an idealistic desire of the 1848 revolutionary government to democratize commemorative practices, nor to real a change in attitude towards Napoleonic figures or even Ney himself, but the result of the new political symbolism the figure of the executed marshal had acquired as a result of recent events. Attempts to rehabilitate Ney had already been made during the July Monarchy. In 1830 his name had been restored to the Legion of Honour and his widow had been granted a pension, however, while sympathetic to Napoleonic figures and willing to offer such small placating gestures, the July Monarchy declined to take the issue any further. In 1831, demands made for Ney's transfer to the Pantheon were unsuccessful, but more ominous was the Minister of the Interior's banning of a play about the trial of Marshal Ney.⁸⁶ In 1832, André-Marie-Jean-Jacques Dupin (1783-1865), who had been one of Ney's legal advisors in 1815, raised the question of revising the judgment, again without success. Ney's son,

⁸⁵'Est-il convenable que la statue d'un général occupe une place publique de la capitale? Cet honneur ne doit-il pas être réservé au Souverain et aux Trophées consacrant sa victoire et sa puissance?' Quoted in Hargrove, *Les Statues de Paris*, Paris, 1989, p. 51

⁸⁶*Les Grands procès*, Paris, vol. 2, 1966, p. 3117

Joseph had been named a peer, but refused to sit until his father had been cleared.⁸⁷ To some extent, the return of Napoleon's ashes was perceived as a tacit form of rehabilitation and vindication for Ney, as well as his executed comrades, at which point a second relief appeared on La Bédoyère's tomb depicting the triumphal event (ill. 129), yet Ney's tomb still remained devoid of any identifying marker. It is doubtful that the censure imposed by the Bourbons continued, but the bare tomb remained as a more powerful, poignant memorial to Ney than any purely commemorative monument. Absence spoke louder than presence, as a persistent reminder of the continuing injustice of the still unreversed judgment of treason, accusatory of both the regime that had executed Ney and the regime that refused to vindicate him.

The difference in meaning between these two aspects, commemoration and vindication, were mirrored in the political considerations governing the decision to erect a public monument to Marshal Ney in Paris. In March 1848 the provisional government decreed a project for a monument to Ney 'on the site where he was executed' but it was delayed and by the time it was eventually erected in 1853, the project's format and meaning had been significantly altered..⁸⁸ The new republic was still only a month old and euphoric idealism was still at its height in those early weeks of March, with plans for universal suffrage, the abolishment of slavery etc..⁸⁹ Ney in particular was the ideal candidate for commemoration as the

⁸⁷*Les Grands procès*, Paris, vol. 2, 1966, pp. 317-318. Joseph Ney finally took his seat in March 1841. *Documents relatifs à la demande en révision du procès du Ml. Ney au mois de novembre 1831 et à la reception du Prince de la Moskowa à la Chambre des Pairs au mois de mars 1841*, Paris, 1841

⁸⁸*Bulletin des Lois*, No. 129, Paris, 1848, p. 130

⁸⁹Maurice Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment*, trans. Janet Lloyd trans., Cambridge, London and New York, 1983, p. 27-8

embodiment of the guiding principles of the revolution and the new republic, as his execution was symbolic of the abuses of what were now labeled as despotic regimes, whether that of the Bourbons, or of the recently overthrown Orleans monarchy, whose failure to rehabilitate Ney was representative of its shortcomings in general, such as its inability to keep the promises of 1830 and renouncing the breadth of social and political reform many had hoped to achieve. In March of 1848, the elevation of Ney to the level of national martyr was symbolic of the people's return and the fulfillment of those failed promises. It was also a reminder of avoiding the pitfalls of the past, and particularly of revolutionary bloodshed, for the spectre of the guillotine of 1793 had inevitably been raised by the establishment of a new republic and in order to dispel this image a decree was issued 26 February, only two days after the abdication of Louis-Philippe, abolishing the death sentence for political offenders.⁹⁰ The decision was not only meant to conjure away the fear of the revival the Terror, but also as a criticism of monarchical regimes, such as the Bourbon Restoration, which had executed political prisoners such as Ney and La Bédoyère, and the four sergeants of La Rochelle, executed in 1822 for conspiring against the regime. As such, the 1848 government's decision to erect a monument can be seen as a reinforcement of the principles set out in the abolishment of the death sentence for political offenses.

Popular posters - at the time, probably the most important means of rapidly disseminating information on a mass scale - circulated in the streets of Paris were particularly important in clarifying Ney's symbolic

⁹⁰See Ch. Seignebos, *La Révolution de 1848 et le Second Empire*, Paris, 1921, vol. 6 of Ernest Lavisse, *Histoire de la France contemporaine*, p. 15 and Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment*, London and New York, 1983, pp. 27-8

status and identifying him with both the Republic and the Revolution of 1848.⁹¹ One poster declared that the government's decision responded to 'the wishes of all of France', but the national appeal of the project was probably exaggerated for Ney's present popularity was rather linked to particular contemporary political affinities. Ney was a commoner, a volunteer, who had risen to marshal's rank through bravery, military genius and merit and as a man of the people, Ney could thus be linked to a republican ideal: 'The People have not forgotten that the brave Marshal Ney emerged from its midst', claimed the poster⁹² Another poster addressing the People recounts an incident witnessed on a barricade, where a coach was stopped during the early hours of the morning. Normally the fighters would have turned it on its side and transformed it into an impromptu barricade but having recognized its passenger as Ney's eldest son, the Prince of the Moskowa, he was immediately released as a fellow patriot. The People, more than ever, identified themselves with his father and the Prince was told 'our brothers are being slaughtered on the boulevards like your father...fifty of our poor innocent, good patriots like him, have just been murdered as well!'⁹³ The incident in question had taken place on 23 February, when the crowd had marched to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to jeer at the hated Guizot. A scuffle with the soldiers

⁹¹The importance of posters was once again demonstrated in 1851: when Louis-Napoleon was preparing his *coup* he began by printing posters addressing the army and the Parisian population. See Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment*, London and New York, 1983, p. 139

⁹²'Le Peuple n'a pas oublié que le brave Ml. Ney sortait lui-même de son sein.' Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, *Appel aux enfants de Paris et aux vieux soldats qui ont servis sous les ordres du Maréchal Ney*

⁹³'...on égorge nos frères sur les boulevards comme [on] a tué votre père près du Luxembourg! cinquante malheureux innocents, bons patriotes comme lui, viennent aussi d'être assassinés!', *Le Peuple de Paris et le Maréchal Ney*, 1848, Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris

escalated into a volley of shots, where 50 or so insurgents were killed. Sixteen of the bodies had been placed into a cart and paraded along the streets of Paris as a call to arms, accompanied with shots of 'To arms! We will avenge them!'.⁹⁴ The affiliation between Ney and the dead insurgents served to associate both the Orleans and Bourbon monarchies with tyrannical execution and furthermore, it made Ney 'one of their own', a revolutionary of 1848.

The monument to Ney thus had a multiple appeal, as both a rejection of the past and the embodiment of the present mode of government but plans for the official monument were unable to go any further. Firstly the provisional government was awaiting the convening of a National Assembly, which alone had the power to ratify their decrees; the elections did not take place until April 23 of that year and Ney's monument would at least have to wait until the election was over. Meanwhile, a temporary monument, oddly reminiscent of the iconography of the first republic, surmounted by a portrait bust of the Marshal, flanked by a Tree of liberty, and draped in spring flowers, sprang up on the site of Ney's execution.⁹⁵ The official monument was however further delayed by political and financial turmoil. France had been in the midst of an economic crisis since 1847, and the revolution had aggravated it by slowing down production, communication and transport. The preoccupation of the working classes with barricades, politics and joining the ranks of the National Guard had slowed manufacturing almost to a halt and in addition the nation was also suffering a monetary crisis, as the Banks struggled to adapt and the

⁹⁴See Charl  ty, *La Monarchie de Juillet*, Paris, 1921, p. 392 and Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment*, London and New York, 1983, pp. 24-5

⁹⁵*L'Illustration*, 13 May, 1848

Bourse remained closed until as late as 7 March.⁹⁶ Coupled with the already existing economic depression, the Nation was severely taxed of funds available for projects such as the Ney monument.

The events of June 1848, the outbreak of a second revolution, further impeded plans and eventually altered and problematized the meaning of the monument.⁹⁷ The Republic of February's promises for social reform for the working classes had already ended in the dissolution of the National Workshops on 22, June and the working classes of Paris reacted by taking up arms, but the insurrection was put down in only a few days and while about 4,000 insurgents were deported to the colonies, others were summarily executed in defiance of the decree of the 26 February.⁹⁸ With the spirit of the decree of 26 February, banning political execution, already abrogated, a monument to Ney, himself a victim of political repression, would hardly have been propitious, as an image of the executed Marshal on the public streets of Paris was tantamount to immortalizing the victims of the June execution as heroic martyrs. Nonetheless, the project survived and resurfaced in 1850.

In 1849, the National Assembly had voted in Dupin, Ney's champion since 1815 and as President and he may have been influential in raising the question of the monument again in 1850.⁹⁹ On 5 March, Minister of the Interior, Ferdinand Barrot (1806- 1883) sent a report to Prince Louis Napoleon, President of the Republic since December 1848, stating that the decree for a monument had now been

⁹⁶Seignobos, *La Révolution de 1848*, Paris, 1921, p. 32

⁹⁷Garros, *Ney*, Paris, 1955, p. 293

⁹⁸Seignobos, *La Révolution de 1848*, Paris, 1921, p. 101-105s

⁹⁹Seignobos, *La Révolution de 1848*, Paris, 1921, p. 137

ratified by the Constituent Assembly.¹⁰⁰ In March, the by-elections had delivered a victory for the left: Louis Napoléon needed to mobilize all the support available for his own increasingly right-wing politics and the glorification of Ney and other Napoleonic heroes, could conveniently be used as propaganda for furthering his own ambitions, which explains why the Larrey monument, delayed since its completion in 1846, was also unveiled in 1850.

Much of the following information surrounding the project has already been dealt with by Ruth Butler in her article on Rude's political sculpture, but a number of details have been neglected which give a more complex reading of the monument.¹⁰¹ In his report of the 5 March, 1850 Barrot gave a description of the monument destined for the very site of execution, as stipulated in the 1848 decree, claiming it would 'represent Marshal Ney pointing to his chest and offering his heart to death...' and explaining that he had already chosen one of France's greatest sculptors for the job.¹⁰² Rude, allegedly wrote to Romieu, Director of the Beaux-arts, alluding to an interview with Barrot concerning the execution of the monument.¹⁰³ Rude's own republicanism and especially his previous work on monuments glorifying the Republic, such as the *Departure of the Volunteers of 1792* (1833-1836) for the Arc de Triomphe, and *Napoleon Awakening to Immortality* (1845-1847) for Captain Noisot's garden, certainly made

¹⁰⁰Archives Nationales, F²¹ 583

¹⁰¹R. Butler, 'Long Live the Revolution, the Republic and Especially the Emperor!: the Political sculpture of Rude, *Art and Architecture in the Service of Politics*, Massachussets and London: 1980

¹⁰²Archives Nationales F²¹ 583. Ferdinand Barrot, *Rapport au President de la République, Napoleon Bonaparte*, 5 March, 1850

¹⁰³L. de Fourcaud, *François Rude, Sculpteur, Ses Oeuvres et son temps (1784-1855)*, Paris, 1904, p. 377

him a likely candidate but legend would also have it that Rude had already been the choice in 1848. There is no real confirmation of the story, only the claim by Romieu, Director of the Beaux-arts, that this had occurred, in an 1852 report to Jean-Gilbert-Victor de Fialin, comte de Persigny (1808-1872), Minister of the Interior. However, Romieu was also a friend and supporter of the sculptor and there are no official documents to substantiate his claim.¹⁰⁴ In fact, it would seem that in 1848, Ney's son would have liked to see the commission given to David d'Angers, whose work and political beliefs also made him an ideal candidate.¹⁰⁵ However, historians have accepted the idea that Rude was the original candidate in 1848, and this has been the foundation for establishing that an undated *bozetto* by Rude, representing Ney, pulling back his coat to indicate his chest for the firing squad to aim at, was actually produced in response to the original 1848 project. (Ill. 160) As a result, historians like Butler have claimed that Barrot must have seen this sketch and made his 1850 description of the project confirm in relation to it.

Ney's execution had not been witnessed by a great number of observers, but a certain romantic image of it had circulated in its wake. Ney was reputed to have refused the use of a blindfold, the troops had allegedly obeyed the Marshal's own signal to shoot and legend would also have it that Ney had pointed to his breast and told the soldiers to

¹⁰⁴According to Fourcauld, *Rude*, Paris, 1904, p. 373

¹⁰⁵François Arago to J. N. Ney, Paris, May, 1848: '...je m'associerai bien volontiers au vœu que vous m'avez exprimé de voir confier à David d'Angers l'exécution du Monument que le gouvernement provisoire a décidée de faire élever à la mémoire de votre illustre père.' Archives Nationales, 137 AP 22.

'Aim for the heart'.¹⁰⁶ According to Rocheouart, the officer in charge of the execution squad, Ney had worn civilian clothing, a blue frock-coat, a white cravat, breeches and black hose, in order to avoid the humiliating divestment of military insignia before the execution.¹⁰⁷ Ney was also reputed to have thrown his hat on the ground before the firing squad.¹⁰⁸ Rude's model certainly conformed as much as possible to these legendary accounts, depicting Ney, appropriately pointing to his breast, dressed in civilian clothes and bare-headed. Therefore as Butler has pointed out, Rude probably conceived his sketch partly in response to popular stories and to widely disseminated popular imagery depicting Ney's death. (ill. 161) Much the same legendary action had been attributed to La Bédoyère, crediting him with the same gesture to his breast and addressing the firing squad with a similar 'Aim here' and illustrations of his execution showed him, like Ney, hand on breast, making the gesture more a general symbol of heroic, courageous behaviour in the face of death, rather than one unique to Ney, and one which also served to emphasize the shameful actions of the executioners.¹⁰⁹ (ill. 162)

The image described by Barrot was therefore one firmly imprinted in the popular imagination, existing quite separately from Rude's sketch, and could have conceivably been elicited by the very same popular sources. Moreover, Barrot seems to have had an entirely different format in mind from the statue *en-piéd* envisaged by Rude in

¹⁰⁶*Les Grands procès*, Paris, 1966, pp. 313-314 and Anon. (Docteur Maximin Legrand), *Rude, sa vie, ses oeuvres, son enseignement, considérations sur la sculpture*, Paris, 1856, p. 112

¹⁰⁷*Les Grands procès*, Paris, 1966, p. 312

¹⁰⁸Anon, *Rude*, Paris, 1856, p. 112

¹⁰⁹Larousse, *Dictionnaire*, vol. 10, Paris, 1873, p. 6

the *bozetto*. In 1850 Barrot had been of the opinion that the monument should contain an 'aspect of austerity and great simplicity', in order to avoid being 'considered as a public mark of an irritating memory', a statement which may have referred to format rather than style or iconographic detail.¹¹⁰ In fact, Barrot may have envisaged a very discreet bas-relief rather than a grandiose full-scale standing figure and therefore was unlikely to have conceived of the project outlined in his report as based on Rude's *bozetto*.¹¹¹ It was only after the project of 1850 had lain more or less dormant for almost two years, and resurfaced in another report dated 22 March, 1852, from Minister of the Interior Persigny to Louis Napoléon, that a suggestion was made for replacing 'the bas-relief that would have retraced the last moments of the Marshal with a statue that would represent him in a military costume'.¹¹² Persigny claimed that in this manner, the monument could be given greater importance, 'an importance more in line with the illustration of the person to whom it was consecrated', all the while maintaining the 'simple and grave character' of the project.

In effect, the decision to erect a full-scale autonomous statue to an individual in the capital was not based on the simple desire for commemoration but firmly embedded in the requirements of political propaganda. In fact, Persigny's report claimed that insufficient funds, changes in administration etc. had delayed the project since 1851, and

¹¹⁰'Il m'a semblé qu'un tel monument, par la nature des souvenirs qu'il reveillera, devrait être d'un aspect sévère et d'une grande simplicité.' Ferdinand Barrot, *Rapport au Président de la République Napoléon Bonaparte*, 5 March, 1850. Archives Nationales F21 583 (II)

¹¹¹While Ruth Butler fails to mention the idea for the bas-relief it has been noted by other art historians such as June Hargrove, *Les Statues de Paris*, 1989, p. 89.

¹¹²Archives Nationales F21 583. *Rapport du Ministre de l'Intérieur, de l'agriculture et du Commerce au Prince-Président de la République*, 22 Mars, 1852

that since the ordinary credit of the Beaux-arts was insufficient, the funds were still lacking, in response to which, Louis Napoleon immediately decreed a special credit for the project of 50,000FF.¹¹³ In many ways the political situation justified the expense of the alterations to the project. To begin with, the revised project for the Ney monument of 1852, with its specification of a 'military costume', rejected a literal depiction of the Marshal's execution itself, with Ney in civilian clothes, which might have evoked the more recent events which had occurred as a result of resistance to the *coup d'état* of December 1851, namely the horrific 'boulevard fusillade' of 3 December, when troops proceeding down the boulevards were insulted by the bourgeois from the balconies above. After a few isolated shots had been fired on the troops on the boulevard Bonne-Nouvelle, soldiers opened fire on the balconies and killed a number of unarmed onlookers.¹¹⁴

Even aside from this tragic incident, in 1850, the Ney monument as it had been conceived by Barrot, warned against the dangers of absolutism, a danger which had fast become reality as Louis Napoléon imposed his dictatorship on the nation. Moreover, in order to achieve his goal, Louis-Napoleon had courted the military, replaced the Orleanist and Legitimist dominated military leaders with those favourable to himself and successfully dismantled the republican element in the government - the very element Ney had embodied in 1848. In December of 1851, Louis-Napoléon's first *coup* was largely successful thanks to the mobilization of the military as was the second

¹¹³Archives Nationales F²¹ 583. Decree 22 March, 1852

¹¹⁴Agulhon, *The Republican Experiment*, London and New York, 1983, pp. 148-9

coup in November of 1852 and the organization of the vote which brought the Second Empire into being. Therefore, in March of 1852, the Ney monument as conceived by Louis-Napoléon was appropriately intended as a glorification of the military, for as Butler has pointed out, the uniform glorified Ney as a soldier rather than a victim. The difference was clearly articulated by the contrast between Barrot's description of the project in 1850 as a sign of 'rehabilitation' and in March of 1852, as an 'homage to the memory of one of our greatest military glories'.¹¹⁵

This change of the perceived role of the monument was clearly expressed in Rude's rendition of Marshal Ney striding forward, sword in hand and advancing to the attack, a military glorification, rather than a scene of heroic martyrdom, in which the resigned and stoic 'Alm here' becomes a screaming, fearsome battle cry. (Ill. 163) The image of Ney's raised arm was legendary amongst those who had served under him and had often seen it in the midst of battle as he called the troops forward. The base of the statue even evoked the battlefield strewn with the debris of artillery (Ill 164), an idea Rude might have gleaned from David's *Larrey* monument at the Val-de-Grâce. The pedestal itself read like a history book, outlining Ney's career, his rise through the ranks, and the battles he took part in. The monument could thus be incorporated into an image of military glory in general and the First Empire in particular, and thereby as an advertisement for the new Empire of Napoleon III.

¹¹⁵Archives Nationales F²¹ 583, Ferdinand Barrot, Minister of the Interior, *Rapport au Président de la République, Napoléon Bonaparte, 5 March, 1850* and '...homage rendu à la mémoire d'une de nos plus grandes gloires militaires...' 22 March, 1852, Minister of the Interior, of Agriculture and Commerce, *Rapport au Président de la République*,

The inauguration of the statue on 7 December, 1853, the anniversary of Ney's death, clearly reflects the monument's intended meaning. It was not a ceremony of mourning and recollection, but a great military demonstration, organized as a massive review of the troops. A letter to the Minister of State from A. Gisors just days before the ceremony indicated that detachments would be taken from each of the army divisions of Paris, and in the same numbers as for a marshal's funeral.¹¹⁶ The whole would be accompanied by salvos of artillery, and a procession of the troops in front of the statue. While the presence of the troops may have given the ceremony the appearance of a symbolic belated grand funeral for Ney, it was geared towards boosting the military's morale, and clearly expressed in Marshal Saint-Arnaud's speech at the inauguration:

'Soldiers! It is above all you that I am entrusted to address today. The glory of Marshal Ney belongs to France, but above all, it is the heritage of the army.'¹¹⁷

Saint-Arnaud followed with a brief history of Ney's distinguished career, emphasizing above all his rise from simple hussar to general of a division in seven years time. Saint-Arnaud's speech was geared as much to encouraging the troops as it was to commemorating Ney, using the Marshal as an example of what they too could hope to achieve and claiming that the inauguration 'had permitted the army to come and

¹¹⁶A. Gisors, December, 1853. Archives Nationales F21 583 (II)

¹¹⁷'Soldats! c'est à vous surtout que j'ai la mission de m'adresser aujourd'hui. La gloire du maréchal Ney appartient à la France, mais elle est d'abord le patrimoine de l'armée.', *Discours prononcé par S. Exc. le Maréchal de Saint-Arnaud, Ministre de la Guerre, Grand-Écuyer de l'Empereur, etc...à la cérémonie d'inauguration de la statue de Maréchal Ney, Duc d'Elchingen, Prince de la Moskowa, Le 7 décembre 1853*, p. 2. Archives Nationales 137 AP 22 Dr. 12

search for military inspirations at the foot of the statue of a great captain.'¹¹⁸

The erection of Ney's statue was the beginning of a series of commemorative monuments glorifying Napoleonic figures in the capital and across the nation under the Second Empire and as a result, the role of the *camp des braves* as a site of sublimated glorification as an enclave of resistance was no longer necessary. Having been a rallying point for the Bonapartist cause during the adverse political conditions of the Restoration and even the July Monarchy, its initial significance was largely lost and with the emphasis on Imperial military history its role as the guardian of memory and historical identity was usurped. This decline in status and importance may explain why despite the erection of a public statue to Ney, a grand show of national homage and celebration, Ney's tomb in the Père Lachaise still remained bare and in 1873 it was still described as 'a small garden filled with flowers, surrounded by a black metal railing, but having no mausoleum or even the smallest mound...'¹¹⁹ There is no record of why the family chose to leave the tomb unadorned. Lack of interest, the obsolescence of the cause Ney symbolized may indeed have been the reason, but then again, there may have been a certain calculated symbolism in allowing the site to remain as romantically vacant as before. As such it remained an accusatory image, for despite the glorification and tacit rehabilitation implied by the public monument, nothing had in fact been done to expunge the court's judgment against Ney and no official

¹¹⁸'...a permis à l'armée de venir chercher des inspirations militaires au pied de la statue d'un grand capitaine.' *Discours prononcé par S. Exc. le Maréchal de Saint-Arnaud*, p. 6. Archives Nationales 137 AP 22 Dr. 12

¹¹⁹Larousse, *Dictionnaire*, Paris, 1873, vol. 10, p. 27

reversal of the decision was ever undertaken. On the contrary, Saint-Arnaud's speech at the inauguration, rather than clearing Ney's name, acknowledged his guilt, dismissing it as forgivable human error. Ney had been 'troubled' by the events of 1814-15 claimed Saint-Arnaud, and posterity must forget 'this passing weakness'.¹²⁰ It was not until 1903 that a monument was erected on the site of the tomb.¹²¹ (ill. 165) By this time the controversy over legal, official rehabilitation must have seemed a distant issue, of no real relevance to contemporary politics. Moreover, the site in Père Lachaise would have been of real financial value, as available plots were a fast diminishing commodity and it was laid out as a family tomb, with lists of descendants names focusing on the central portrait medallion of their ancestor Marshal Ney.

While the end of the royal monopoly on commemoration in the capital and the rise of the autonomous monument dedicated to individuals of merit might have once been idealistically perceived as the result of nineteenth-century France's transformation into an increasingly equitable and democratic society, the foundation of the movement, the monument to Marshal Ney was clearly erected as a political expedient. If any space could be said to be devoted to democratic principles of commemoration, it was Père Lachaise, where oppositional camps still found a voice and might hope to escape censorship. The configuration of that opposition was however constantly shifting along with the political climate of the capital. By 1853, if Napoleonic veterans were no longer in need of a safe haven for

¹²⁰*Discours prononcé par S. Exc. le Maréchal de Saint-Arnaud*, p. 5. Archives Nationales 137 AP 22 Dr. 12

¹²¹*Les Grands procès*, Paris, 1966, p. 318

their memories, the funerals of Mme. Raspail and Arago offered the chance for the republican opposition to Napoleon III to register their presence. Arago's monument, discussed in Chapter 4, with its bust by David d'Anger's, erected through an international subscription attested by its simple presence to a massive solidarity for a republican figure. Raspail had been jailed in 1849 for six years and Mme. Raspail's tomb was accusatory in its imagery, depicting the woman pining at the prison window of her husband. (ill 166) She had died before his release and the image was all the more potent for this.

In the second half of the century Père Lachaise was joined by the cemeteries of Montmartre and Montparnasse as spaces for free expression, but the Second Empire had gleaned a few lessons from its predecessors in regards to the practice. On the 5 November, 1868 the newspaper *Le Reveil* launched a public subscription for a funerary monument for Alphonse Baudin (1801-1851), who had died on the barricades in December 1851 defending the Republic, and whose tomb had been recently been rediscovered. In what was to become known as the *Affaire Baudin*, Louis Charles Délécluze (1809-1871), the owner of the paper was tried, the project was suppressed and it was not until the fall of the Empire that the bronze *gisant* by Aimé Millet (1819-1891) was inaugurated in 1872 at Montmartre cemetery.¹²² (ill. 167) It is interesting to note, that in the case of Baudin, as with Ney, censorship actually fueled the fires of notoriety and increased the status of the symbolic martyr-hero. The amount of attention given to the commemoration of Ney after 1848 was paralleled and even

¹²²See Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, "'En hommage aux opposants politiques', Monument funéraire ou public?", *Revue de l'Art*, No. 94, 1991, p.76

outdone by that given to Baudin after the fall of the Empire: in 1889 Baudin's ashes were transferred to the Pantheon and a statue (now destroyed) by Eugène Boverie was erected in 1901 in Paris. In light of this, it would seem that attempts to prevent the pilgrimages and gatherings around tombs through censorship were actually a greater threat to order than the opposition monuments themselves, and in retrospect, the cemeteries may actually have been useful in channeling anti-government sentiment in a controlled setting.

Chapter Seven

Death in the Family: Socio-economic Status and the Family Tomb

Before the Nineteenth Century family tombs and mausoleums in France had been erected on private estates or in churches. Eighteenth-century legislation had made it difficult to be buried in churches, but families nonetheless continued to seek, and often received, permission for burial inside private chapels. A number of decrees had also affirmed the right of individuals to be buried on private property as long as this property was located outside the city limits.¹ Yet, during the first half of the century, it was increasingly in the cemetery that family mausoleums were established and according to Philippe Ariès, burial on private property actually disappeared to a large extent in France during this period because administrative powers had never really approved of it and despite existing legislation, were inclined to exert pressure on the municipalities to ban it.² Moreover, a more rigid enforcement of the law banning burial inside churches during the July Monarchy - largely thanks to the efforts of Minister Montalivet (1801-1880) - forced families to seek other alternatives, which may in part explain the rapid expansion of family tombs and especially mausolea at Père Lachaise during the period.³

¹Including Arrêté du Departement de la Seine 23 Germinal, year IV (12 April, 1796), 21 Ventôse, year IX (12 March, 1801) and Imperial Decree 23 Prairial, year XII (12 June 1804)

²Philippe Ariès, *The Hour of our Death*, Helen Weaver, trans., London, 1981, p. 523

³For July Monarchy initiatives see Kselman, *Death and the Afterlife in Modern France*, Princeton and Chichester, 1993, p. 177

In contrast with the tombs of illustrious figures and the family chapels and mausolea of preceding centuries, whose dynastic, economic and political import has been recognized, the family tomb in the nineteenth-century cemetery has been largely analyzed only in private and domestic terms. For example, historians of funerary monuments such as Antoinette Le Normand Romain have written that 'whatever their magnitude, the aim of most monuments erected by the family is to demonstrate the pain caused by the death of a loved one, parent or child.'⁴ Much the same idea has been expressed by Philippe Ariès' assertion that 'the cemeteries of the nineteenth Century were museums of family love' and that inscriptions, 'funerary rhetoric was not aimed at the unknown passer-by, as the brief medieval epitaph had been. It was addressed to relatives and friends.'⁵ To be fair, Ariès was referring to the idea that funerary monuments of the Middle Ages were intended to make passers-by reflect on their own death and that this was no longer the case in the Nineteenth Century.

The preponderance of nineteenth-century images illustrating the grieving widow and offspring in front of the deceased husband's tomb are partially to blame for circulating the idea that the main role of the family tomb was purely the reification of personal loss and grief. However, it has been pointed out that these images were inspired as much by ideas about the perceived role of women in society and in the family - faithful to and dependent on their husbands or fathers - and

⁴'Quelle que soit leur importance, la plupart des monuments élevés par la famille ont pur but de manifester la douleur suscitée par la mort d'un proche, parent ou enfant.' Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, *Mémoire de Marbre; La Sculpture funéraire en France, 1804-1914*, Paris, 1995, p. 111

⁵Philippe Ariès, *Images of Man and Death*, translated Janet Lloyd, Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1985, pp. 259 and 260

by the erotic charge derived from the languid poses and sensual gaze of some of these mourners.⁶ (ill. 168) While such nineteenth-century images and twentieth-century analysis certainly contain some truth, they also present a very limited analysis of the family tomb, of its emergence, rise and transformation during the first half of the Nineteenth Century and one that is often premised on vague notions such as the new found 'sensibility that...rendered the death of the other intolerable' described by Ariès for example.⁷ Within this context the family tomb rarely breaches the boundaries of private pain and mourning, religious devotion and personal sentiment. Yet the notion of the family itself can actually be analyzed as a highly politicized set of ideals, one whose evolution during this period can be shown to have had repercussions on the function and meaning of these monuments.

For centuries much of the political and economic importance of the family had been based on aristocratic bloodlines, but towards the end of the Eighteenth Century, perhaps for the first time, domestic family relations were perceived as having a political role as well. The Bourbon Restoration is a period particularly singled out by historians as giving great importance to the family,⁸ illustrated by legislation, such as the abolition of divorce -legalized by the Napoleonic Code- in 1816⁹, but this was partially based on an attempt to create an image of the current regime in contrast with the projected image of immorality,

⁶See Kselman, *Death and the Afterlife*, 1993, pp. 217-217 and Ariès, *Images of Man and Death*, 1985, p. 210

⁷Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death*, 1981, p. 555

⁸For example Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, Paris, 1955; p.244

⁹See Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, Paris, 1955; p.244 and Michelle Perrot and Anne Martin-Fugier, 'The Family Triumphant', *A History of Private Life, From the Fires of revolution to the Great War*, ed. Michelle Perrot, Translated Arthur Goldhammer, Harvard, 1990; pp. 104-106

chaos and family breakdown during the post-revolutionary period and partially the result of the religious revival occasioned by the renewed influence of the Church. However, the perceived political role of domestic family values preceded the Restoration and Lynn Hunt, in a study of the history of private life, has argued that during the Revolutionary period private behaviour, character and morality in general were often equated with public, political ones.¹⁰ It was a belief that underscored much of the criticism of the Ancien Regime's grotesque mockery of family values and especially of the Queen, Marie-Antoinette, accused of adultery, debauchery and bearing illegitimate children.¹¹ The rumours were certainly at odds with her portrayal as the ideal mother in portraits by Vigée-Lebrun, but then these paintings may in fact have been a conscious strategy to counter this reputation, for since the well-being of the family, as a generic term, was perceived to be an indicator of the well-being of society in general, it had developed into a primary political and sociological concern.

Believing that the family was the key to achieving the ideal society, legislators of the post-revolutionary period attempted to strengthen and maintain it by fostering certain domestic virtues. In particular, there was a great deal of attention given to the role which rituals of bereavement, burial and commemoration of loved ones played within the family unit. The extent to which these ideas were circulated is well illustrated by Gaspard Delamalle's heart wrenching account of his mother's burial in a common grave, which proved so

¹⁰For revolutionary perceptions of private and political character see Lynn Hunt, 'The Unstable Boundaries...', *A History of Private Life*, 1990, pp. 13-16

¹¹For Marie-Antoinette's reputation see Lynn Hunt, 'The Unstable Boundaries of the French Revolution', *A History of Private Life*, 1990, p. 22

popular that a second edition was published a year later. Delamalle, a well-known lawyer, claimed that establishing decent burial practices and rituals of bereavement fostered precisely the right kinds of emotions and virtues, 'the noble feelings of the heart, inspiring filial piety, endearing domestic virtues', that would also inspire 'all good citizens to be worthy of the *patrie*'.¹² Furthermore, in December of 1797, Lafargue argued dramatically in front of the Council of 500 that the immoral spectacle of indecent burial practices which had assaulted the eyes of the French for a long time was a serious threat to the future civil status, fate and security of the family, which to his contemporaries would be perceived as direct threat to social stability in general.¹³

For many, the only real way of establishing the kind of burial practices that would foster domestic grief and family ties was by legislating for individual, demarcated and identifiable burial places as opposed to the mass graves which had been the norm for some time, an argument raised for example, by Daubermesnil, in his official report to the Council of 500 (11 November, 1796).¹⁴ Others, such as Mulot in his response to Daubermesnil's report, went even further and used it as an argument for individual monuments, which were still opposed by many

¹²'Le soin des funérailles et des tombeaux...est fait pour nourrir tous le nobles sentiments du coeur, pour inspirer le respect de la piété filiale, pour mettre un prix aux vertus domestiques, pour animer tous les bons citoyens à bien mériter de la patrie...' Gaspard Gilbert Delamalle, *Reflexions sur l'enterrement de ma mère, or sur les cérémonies funéraires et la moralité des institutions civiles en générales*, Paris, 1795, p. 8

¹³'...un spectacle hideux et immoral frappe depuis longtemps les yeux des Français; l'état civil des familles, leur fortune, leur surété sont menacés dans l'avenir...' Lafargue, *Sur la police des cimetières et des inhumations*, Corp Législatif-Conseil des 500, 14 Frimaire, an 7 (4, December, 1797); pp. 1-2

¹⁴Daubermesnil, *Rapport fait au nom d'une commission spéciale sur les inhumations*, Corps Législatif, Conseil des 500, 21 Brumaire, year V, (11 November, 1796), p. 9

as signs of social and economic inequality.¹⁵ As discussed in Chapter One, the proponents of freedom in erecting individual monuments eventually won, but it is possible to argue that the decision to allow for individual monuments was at least partially driven by this perception that domestic family values played an important political role in the reformation of society and government. The notion of the family, however, not being a stable and permanent one, but one altered by further economic and political transformations, the manner in which domestic virtues and family ties would be expressed in the cemetery would prove to be equally fluid, reflected in a variety of styles, shapes and types of monument as well as their sites.

This chapter focuses on the development of one distinct formula for the expression of the notion of the family and of domestic unity, namely the family tomb and its particular significance in relation to the definition and identity of the family during the period discussed. The relevance of this particular commemorative format becomes especially clear when contrasted with other types of monument elicited by the death of a family member. For example, the pyramid shaped monument of Mme. Frémont, *née* Antoinette Bobée - who died in 1805, shortly after losing her only child, a ten-month old daughter - is possibly the oldest monument in stone in the cemetery. According to the cemetery's archives, the tomb also contains the remains of the daughter, who had died about a month earlier than the mother. (ill. 169) Moreover, the inscription on the tomb indicates that in death husband and wife will be reunited in the tomb. Yet, the monument

¹⁵François-Valentin Mulot, *Vues d'un citoyen, Ancien Député de Paris à l'Assemblée législative, sur les sépultures*, year V

itself is for all intents and purposes that of Mme. Bobée alone, with no indication that this is, or might ever be a family tomb. The same can be said of the tomb of the merchant Pierre Gareau, best known for the exquisite female mourner by the sculptor Aimé Milhomme (1758-1822) which decorates the monument. (ill. 170) Erected in 1815 by Gareau's widow and six children, the plaque on the front of the monument is dedicated exclusively to the deceased father, yet on the back, ostensibly as an after-thought, are inscribed the names of the Gareau children, the first death being recorded as early as 1816, as well as the widow who died in 1852. In these cases the death of a family member was perceived very much as a single event rather than in terms of a cohesive unit. In terms of the Bobée tomb, it would seem that the importance of the child, granted perhaps because of its youth, was of little or no consequence and was therefore disregarded in the inscription. In the Gareau tomb, while the family as a whole was recognized, as well as being physically reunited, it was not a concept that was formulated or thought relevant in the initial creation of the tomb. It is important to keep this distinction in mind in the analysis of tombs elicited by the loss of a family member, but whose focus was from the outset to be a family tomb and whose form and style signified that intention.

One of the simplest means adopted by families for commemorating the family in its entirety was by purchasing larger plots where headstones representing individual members of the family, could be grouped, often enclosed and delimited by distinctive iron railings, or chains linked by pillars. Headstones were sometimes uniform, increasing the sense of unity in the enclosures. For example,

the Jérôme family plot, in which the earliest tomb dates back to 1820, consists of three practically identical headstones enclosed by an iron railing. (ill. 171) M. and Mme. Delabarre have 'his' and 'her' matching obelisks erected in a contained enclosure, surrounded by an iron railing (c.1830-39). (ill. 172) More often than not though, family enclosures were a hodgepodge of varying tombs and in many ways they seemed to reflect the power structure and relationships of the living family. In particular, if one member of the family had any claim to fame, their tomb would often dominate the rest, much as their reputations must have dominated the rest of the family during their lifetimes.

Such is the case of the Brongniart family enclosure, surrounded by a small iron railing, in which the tomb of the most famous member of the family, Alexandre-Théodore Brongniart, architect and designer of Père Lachaise (died 1813) dominates the space by both size and decoration: it is the largest amongst the three headstones and has the most elaborate decoration, with its bas-relief of the Bourse, Brongniart's most famous work. (ills. 173 and 31, Brongniart's tomb is discussed in Chapter Two) In fact it is the only headstone with reference to any achievement whatsoever. There is a separate headstone for his wife Anne-Louise-Émilie Dégremont, who followed him in 1829 and while couples like the Delabarre's mentioned above, sometimes opted for separate headstones, Alexandre Brongniart (died 1847) - son of Alexandre-Théodore and Anne-Louise - and his wife, Jeanne Cécile Coquebert (died 1862) chose to be commemorated jointly under one headstone in the family enclosure. In light of this, one might speculate whether the commemoration of the parents with separate

headstones was also the result of the architect's fame, a matter of taste, or more ample finances etc.?

Similarly the enclosure of the Cartellier family is dominated by the fame of the sculptor Pierre, although there is probably also something to be said for the fact that like Alexandre-Théodore Brongniart, Pierre Cartellier was also the patriarch of the family. (ill. 174) The larger tomb of the father, who died in 1841, is accompanied on either side by the two smaller, almost identically shaped, headstones of his daughter Charlotte Cartellier, who died in 1825 and Mme. Cartellier, who died in 1848. In size and position the tombs seem to re-enact the roles of the family unit, with the figure of the man, looming large in between the two women. Pierre Cartellier's talents, career and fame are displayed along the sides of the sarcophagus designed by the architect J.B. Le Sueur (1794-1883) and decorated with female allegorical figures sculpted by his students representing their teacher's virtues. (ill. 175) Standing in niches between classical Corinthian columns are figures of *Friendship* by Petitot, *Sagacity* by Augustin Dumont (1801-1884), *Goodness* by François Rude (1784-1855), *Modesty* by Bernard-Gabriel Seurre (1795-1867), *Talent* by Emile Seurre (1798-1858) and *Glory* by Henri Lemaire (1789-1880). On the front of the sarcophagus is a bust of Cartellier by Petitot.

In contrast the tombs of the Cartellier women are decorated with bas-reliefs that recall only domestic virtues and private relationships. Charlotte's tomb, erected by her husband F. L. Heim, displays the grief of her family in a bas-relief, by Petitot, representing antique mourners, one male, one female, leaning against each other in grief. (ill. 176) Rather than simply symbolically mourning they seem to be engaged in

a specific antique mourning ritual. Behind the man to the left is a small column, which in antiquity would have marked a tomb, draped with wreaths placed there, no doubt, by the mourning couple. The woman holds an antique pitcher in her hand, now empty, its mouth facing downward, evoking perhaps the practice in antiquity of spilling oil at the tomb. Or perhaps they were watering the young tree in between them, which the man touches tenderly, symbolically acting out the nurturing of their child, whose loss in the prime of her life is alluded to by the scythe at the base of the tree. Madame Cartellier's tomb, the last of the three, actually illustrates the purpose of the family enclosure as a space of both physical and symbolic reunion with its bas-relief by E. Seurre, where three draped figures rise up to heaven. (ill. 177)

These would seem to represent the three inhabitants of the enclosure; the central figure is no doubt Pierre himself embracing his wife and the smaller figure of his daughter on either side of him, echoing the very position of their tombs.

The family enclosure, its assortment of tombs, was not however the most popular choice, overshadowed by the abundance of single, unified family monuments and eventually mausoleums, a choice which can be analyzed in relation to certain economic and social transformations brought about by the evolution of a capitalist society. To begin with the family tomb itself can be perceived as partially promoted by French society's repudiation of radical leftist republican ideas and the shameless embracement of unequitable personal gain, property and wealth, since in 1798, Cambry's support for the right to erect individual monuments was actually founded on the premise that 'equality is no more compromised by a tomb in a cemetery than by a

palace in our cities'.¹⁶ The tomb was thus correlated with private property, the badge of success in the prevailing laissez-faire economic system of the period, a system which encouraged its citizens to engage in commerce and industry and prosper and which can also be said to have been an important factor in the rise of the bourgeoisie during this period. The effect of the growth of a capitalist society on both the bourgeoisie and the evolution of the cemetery at Père Lachaise and capitalism seems to be supported by the work of Adeline Daumard on the distribution of wealth in the capital during the first half of the Nineteenth Century, when only 17% of the population had the 15 francs necessary to pay for their own funeral, the remainder of the population being buried in pauper's graves. Indeed, Daumard's study indicates that the ability to purchase a plot and erect a tomb at Père Lachaise defined one's status as bourgeois, so that in many ways the cemetery can be defined as primarily a bourgeois space with its various gradations of wealth and status.¹⁷ Capitalism itself was also firmly based on the family unit. As Michelle Perrot writes, 'business history is primarily family history': commercial and industrial advancement of the bourgeoisie relied on family structure, which regulated and fostered capital accumulations.¹⁸ This public, political and economical role played by the bourgeois family was reflected in the preponderance of bourgeois family tombs erected at Père Lachaise during this period

¹⁶'...l'égalité n'est pas plus compromise par un tombeau dans un cimetière que par un palais dans nos villes.' Jacques Cambry, Administrateur du Département de la Seine, Administrateur de prytanée français et de l'académie des antiquaires de Cortone, *Rapport sur les sépultures, Présenté à l'Administration centrale du Département de la Seine*, Paris, Year VII (1798), p. 22

¹⁷Adeline Daumard, *La Bourgeoisie parisienne de 1815 à 1848*, Paris, 1963, p. 11

¹⁸Michelle Perrot and Anne Martin-Fugier, 'The Family Triumphant', *A History of Private Life*, 1990, p. 121

and as in previous chapters, the tomb was a means of both formulating and commemorating the evolving socio-economic and political identities of this sector of society, identities which were expressed in certain choices about style, size and site of monuments.

The family monuments of the bourgeoisie appear in such a variety of styles including sarcophagi like that of the Lefèvre family, erected in 1812 after the death of Jean-Louis Lefèvre and illustrated by Arnaud in 1825 (ill. 178 and 179), simple columns such as that of the Briand family, probably erected in 1815 and recorded by Roger in 1816 (ill 180), and aedicular style monuments, which proved particularly popular, such as that of the Deladreue family tomb, probably founded in 1809 after the death of Jean-Charles Deladreue, grocer and general storekeeper (ill. 181).¹⁹ Yet, despite these variations in styles the monuments share a number of important features which give them common significance. To begin with, their function is readily identifiable thanks to the almost universal appearance of a label along the lines of 'Sépulture de la Famille....' That function is translated into a common configuration below ground, since despite their differences in style, these generally modest monuments usually covered a spacious subterranean vault below. For example Arnaud described the Lefèvre tomb as being one of the finest in the cemetery with room for 10 to 12 people.²⁰

¹⁹See C.-P Arnaud, *Receuil des tombeaux des quatre cimetières de Paris, avec leurs épitaphes et leurs inscriptions, (Père Lachaise, Montmartre, Vaugirard et Sainte Catherine dans le Faubourg Saint Michel)*, 42 planches gravés: *Plan topographique du Père-Lachaise*, 2 vols. 1817-1825, Paris, vol. 2, 1825, pp. 50- 53 and p. 33, plates 65-67 and plate 57; Roger, père et fils, *Le Champs du Repos*, vols. 1-2, Paris, 1816, vol. 1, p. 286, plate 16, no. 757.

²⁰Arnaud, *Receuil*, Paris, vol. 2, 1825, pp. 50-53

Significantly, of all the family tombs with single monuments mentioned above, only the Lefèvre monument has an individual epitaph for a Jean-Louis Lefèvre, because, unlike the enclosures, these tombs were less representative of the family's infrastructure than of their solidarity and unity. While family enclosures were representative of a desire for family members to be buried next to one another, as we have seen in the example above, what emerged was a gathering of a variety of individuals, where one member might largely overshadow the others. Moreover, while the sculptural decoration of A. T. Brongniart or Pierre Cartellier's tombs contained specific references to personal attributes and achievements, the unified family monument usually eschewed any individual references, in favour of the family as a whole, resulting in monuments which were almost exclusively devoid of any lavish decoration and largely architectonic structures which presented the family as a whole, a part of a unified tradition.

This increasing and significant desire for families to present a unified front meant that in some cases, groups of individual monuments were actually replaced by single family tombs. For example, the identical pair of sarcophagi of Marshal Kellerman, Duke of Valmy (1735-1820) and his wife the Duchess of Valmy (died 1812) were exchanged for a large-scale family mausoleum dated 1840. (Ill. 182) The Kellerman family, originating from Saxony, but long established in commerce in Strasbourg, had already achieved noble status under the Ancien Regime. Marshal Kellerman had however embraced the political ideas of revolutionary thinkers and his son François Étienne (1770-1835) followed in his footsteps in his dislike for the Restoration regime. His death in 1835, may have raised the

necessity of transforming the two separate monuments into a family tomb, however, it may equally have been the legitimist aspirations of the Marshal's grandson which prompted the change. François-Christophe-Edmond (1802-1868) was elected to the Chamber of Deputies in 1838, and again in 1839 and 1842, where he supported the right wing extremists and legitimists.²¹ It may well have been this Kellerman's right wing political beliefs that inspired him to establish a dynastic family tomb in the tradition of Ancien Regime nobility.

While the Kellermans cannot be qualified as bourgeois, this preference for the single family monument and its portrayal of the family as a cohesive unit nonetheless also reflected developments in the bourgeoisie's own perception and definition of the family. Dynastic preoccupation's amongst the bourgeoisie in nineteenth-century France were on the rise during this period and as an insightful study of the bourgeoisie after 1815 by Adeline Daumard has demonstrated, 'social and financial success were frequently combined with a desire to be attached to a tradition', resulting in an increasing importance on notions of heritage and professional or commercial bloodlines.²² According to Daumard, this need to be attached to a family tradition was expressed in, and governed, burial practices, virtually overriding the religious preoccupations of the past.²³ An increasing preference for mausoleums instead of family monuments can be seen as an

²¹For biographical information on the Kellermans see *La Grande Encyclopédie*, 31 vols., Paris, n.d., vol. 21, pp. 462-463

²²'...réussite sociale et financière se combinait fréquemment avec le souci de se rattacher à une tradition...' Adeline Daumard, *Les Bourgeois et la bourgeoisie en France depuis 1815*, Paris, 1987, p. 182. Also see pp. 152-182

²³Daumard, *Les Bourgeois*, 1987, p. 215

amplification of this expression of a newly defined bourgeois family tradition.

According to Arnaud, the Bonnomet family established one of the very first structures which could be identified as a mausoleum, in that it was a structure one could actually physically enter. (ill. 183) It was established in 1809 after the death of Dame Adelaïde Laperrière, wife of Mr. Bonnomet and must have been completed by 1810, when the remains of a daughter who had died in 1801 were transferred there.²⁴ In the shape of a monumental pyramid, with a metal door, and capped by a funerary urn it is representative of the early preference for Egyptian funerary styles. Reminiscent of military campaigns, a taste for Egyptian style items such as furniture and decorative items had become popular during the Empire. At the same time, obelisks and pyramids were popular forms for tombs in Père Lachaise and Brongniart's 1810 plans for the central cemetery chapel had been in the shape of a massive pyramid. A number of family mausoleums from this period were also pyramidal, such as that of the family of number of Nicolas-Joseph Clary, established in 1815 (ill. 184), the Gémond family mausoleum (ill. 185, c. 1819) or even later that of the Bouillat family in 1824 (ill. 186), but by the 1820s, the pyramid had already declined greatly in favour.²⁵

Again it was Brongniart himself who seems to have been a source of inspiration for the evolution of the family tomb, for while he had chosen the pyramid for the central chapel, he designed the Greffuhle

²⁴Arnaud, *Receuil*, vol. 2, 1825, p. 26

²⁵For Gémond mausoleum, see Marcèle Le Clerc, *Guide des cimetières de Paris*, Paris, 1990, p. 76. Illustrated in *Monuments funéraires choisis dans les cimetières de Paris et des principales villes de France*, dessinés, gravés et publiés par Normand, aîné, Paris, 1847, Plate 43.

family mausoleum in the gothic style, of which an illustration had actually been included in his plans for the cemetery of around 1810. Certainly the gothic style had greater affinities with the traditional Christian family chapels in churches than the pagan pyramid, but it was probably not the religious associations of the style that had the greatest impact, because as a style for the family mausoleum the gothic did not actually gain much popularity until mid-century, in the wake of the Gothic effusions of the Orleans family tomb at Dreux and the restoration work at the Sainte Chapelle and Nôtre-Dame in Paris by Viollet-le-Duc and others. Despite the religious revival experienced during the Restoration, it was not until mid-century that a renewal of religious fervour transformed the family mausoleum into a miniature Christian chapel, complete with altars, stained glass, candles and prayer stools.²⁶ By far however, during the first half of the century, the classical style was most popular for family mausoleums and the most common form was that of an enlarged sarcophagus, much like that of Delille's tomb, which was large enough to contain an altar and some simple seating inside. This simple, antique design was reiterated in numerous mausoleums such a that of the Bosquillon family (ill. 187, c.1814), down to the same lachrymatory vases used on Delille's tomb (ills. 25 and 26), on either side of the doorway or the Brézin family (ill. 188, c. 1816). Moreover, the simple antique format could be developed into even larger, more house-like structures such as that of the Poreet family mausoleum, established c.1814 (ill. 189).

²⁶Philippe Ariès, 'Du sentiment moderne de la famille dans les testaments et les tombeaux', *Essais sur l'histoire et la mort en occident*, Paris, 1975, p. 141

What seems most important here though is less the specific style and its significance, religious in the case of the Gothic, or pagan in the case of the classical, but rather its form. Firstly the square structure certainly afforded greater space inside the mausoleum than that of the pyramid and secondly, it was in the shape of a miniature building or house. In his analysis of the sociology of funerary architecture, Michel Ragon reveals the existence of a mimetic relationship between the dwellings of the living and those of the dead that cuts across a variety of centuries, civilizations and cultures, in which mausoleums could be considered as extensions of the family dwelling or even a projection of the desire for a prestigious dwelling.²⁷ In nineteenth-century Paris this was illustrated by the frequency with which prominent architects were used to design mausoleums and in some cases, as Antoinette Le Normand-Romain has pointed out, the same architect might be used to design both dwelling and mausoleum. For example, Visconti designed both the Collot family's *hôtel particulier* on the Rue Solférino and their mausoleum at Père Lachaise (c. 1820-30).²⁸ Like the *hôtel particulier*, a grandiose family mausoleum signified wealth, power and prestige, and had once been the reserve of great aristocratic families but both were now increasingly being appropriated by the bourgeoisie.

Historically the family residence has long been a symbol of a continuing tradition, a link across the generations but for many nineteenth-century bourgeois families, the achievement of greater social and economic status was relatively recent, the tradition to be passed on was newly established and proclaimed by impressive new

²⁷Michel Ragon, *L'espace de la mort, Essai sur l'architecture, la décoration et l'urbanisme funéraires*, Paris, 1981, pp. 37-49

²⁸Le Normand-Romain, *Mémoire de Marbre*, 1995, p. 108

family residences. As Daumard writes, 'the transmission of a tradition based on references to the founders of the achieved status is a trait of the hereditary bourgeoisie, great and small...' and no where was this more apparent than with the establishment of the family mausoleum, which in terms of Daumard's analysis, might then be speculated as being itself an essential demonstration or characteristic of being bourgeois.²⁹ The consciousness of the significance of the establishment of a mausoleum was even more apparent in cases where the monument preceded the death of the leading member of the family, as in the two following examples. The Clary family had already risen considerably in status over a century before - somewhere between François Clary, a stocking merchant in the Seventeenth Century and his namesake, born in 1725, who became one of the most influential business men in his region of Marseilles - but towards the end of the Eighteenth Century, Nicolas-Joseph Clary, an engineer, had risen even further beyond his mercantile background. In addition the Clary family had become even more powerful and influential through involvement and marriages with the Bonaparte family. It was this new found status, rather than the commercial heritage of the family, that was reflected in the establishment of the large pyramidal family mausoleum -discussed above - in 1815, which, not coincidentally, coincided with Clary's having been made a Count by Napoleon on the 4 June, 1815, during the Hundred Days. (ill. 184) Despite his colossal fortune, Clary was actually reputed to be a very tight-fisted man to the extent of not even maintaining an appropriate household, but the importance of the

²⁹'...la transmission d'une tradition fondé sur la référence aux fondateurs de la position acquise est un des traits de la bourgeoisie héréditaire, ^{grande} ou petite.' Daumard, *Les Bourgeois*, 1987, p. 215

mausoleum as a public statement of newly acquired social status must have overridden his parsimony. Moreover, because of Napoleon's hasty departure, Clary never actually received his letters patent and the mausoleum may have been the only physical symbol of his new status until his death in 1823.³⁰

Jean Henri Louis Greffuhle was born in Amsterdam in 1774, but it was in France that he established himself as one of the nation's largest real estate owners, with property concentrated in the Seine et Marne region. Greffuhle consolidated the elevated status of his family in their new home with the purchase of an exceptionally large plot, listed as being 36 metres in the Père Lachaise archives, in 1810.³¹ (ill. Greffuhle did not actually become like Clary, a member of the 'bourgeoisie annobli' until December 15, 1818, when he was made a count, and the impressive gothic chapel may have been a reflection of his aspirations to the nobility, but it was also the symbolic assertion of the very real power and status Greffuhle had achieved by establishing himself as a large landowner.³² (ill. 24) During the first half of the century, power and money remained firmly in the hands of the

³⁰For history of the Clary family, see C. d'E.-A., *Dictionnaire des familles françaises à la fin du dix-neuvième siècle*, vol. 2, Evreux, 1912. Clary's miserliness was described in the correspondence of Désirée Clary. See Gabriel Girod de l'Ain, *Désirée Clary, d'après sa correspondance inédite avec Bonaparte, Bernadotte et sa famille*, Paris, 1959, p. 254

³¹Unfortunately there is no indication of whether the measurements given represent square metres. However, the configuration of the plots as they appear in Arnaud's illustrations are oblong indicating that the numbers do not represent square meters. Rather since the minimum size of a plot in the cemetery was established as 1 metre by 2 metres, it would seem that for the purchase of each 2 metres in length, the width was only of 1 metre. The size of plots was set down in Article 4, *Règlement générale des cimetières de la ville de Paris*, Prefecture du Département de la Seine. Quoted in N. Richard, *Le Véritable conducteur au Père-Lachaise, Montrouge, Montparnasse et Vaugirard*, Paris, 1830, p. 19

³²For biographical information see *La Grande Encyclopédie*, Paris, n.d., vol. 19, p. 355

landowners, a group which constituted most of the nation's elite. In the 1840's for example, 377 of the richest tax-paying notables of the nation were landowners, while only 45 were bankers and 26 were industrialists.³³

Through the analysis of statistical and historical information, Daumard has also pointed out a trend, especially prevalent before 1848, for working class and rural immigrants to the capital to ascend into the petty and middle bourgeoisie by engaging in craft industries or retail businesses.³⁴ This is significant in two ways. First as an example of ascendancy into and within the bourgeoisie itself. In comparison, the rise of the Clary and Greffuhle family seem more symptomatic of a rise above, a repudiation of bourgeois status, which was also common during the period and exemplified by attempts to change names and acquire aristocratic heritage with the addition of a 'particule'.³⁵ However, it is the rise from poor, working class origins, to petty bourgeois status, and from petty bourgeois to middle and upper bourgeoisie, that is more commonly discernible from the examination of family tombs at Père Lachaise. Eschewing for the moment the question of migration, which is not always verifiable by the information given on epitaphs, it is clear that most of the moderate family monuments do indeed show links with small-scale production, small business and a variety of professions. For example, J. H. Gauthier (died 1814) was a metallurgist and former employee of the Royal Mint, whose family tomb is a small monument over a vault. (ill. 190) The monument of the Kropper family is also a small monument over a

³³Roger Magraw, *The Bourgeois Century*, New York and Oxford, 1986, p. 51

³⁴Daumard, *Les Bourgeois*, 1987, p. 179

³⁵Daumard, *La Bourgeoisie parisienne*, Paris, 1963, pp. 175-6

vault. (ill. 191) The plot was actually purchased in 1811, just days before the death of the patriarch of the family, Jean-Charles, who manufactured ceramic stoves.³⁶ The Deladreue family erected an aedicular style monument, discussed above, over a vault when the head of their family, a grocer, died in 1809. (ill. 181) The Tardieu family tomb was erected after the death of André M., a merchant from Boulogne, who died in Paris in 1827. (ill. 192) Pierre Jacquemart (1730-1804) is best remembered as one of the founders and directors of the *comptoir d'escompte*, but his origins were also in trade. (ill. 193) Charles Fieffé, whose family tomb was established after his death in 1807, was a notary.³⁷ (ill. 194) Much like their wealthier, more powerful counterparts in the upper bourgeoisie and newly promoted nobility, these families share the idea of the family tomb as the means of founding a tradition, a tradition whose source is invariably a patriarchal figure, largely responsible for the family's ascendancy, the founding figure of a hereditary family profession or business and the erection of the mausoleum often coincided with the death of that figure.

In 1809, the Soëhnée family purchased a relatively large freehold plot after the death of Suzanne Elisabeth Stahl Soëhnée, age 67, but originally they erected only a small monument, decorated with upside down torches at the angles and topped with an owl astride a funerary urn, which was recorded and illustrated by Roger in 1816 (plate II, no. 582). The small monument, like some of those discussed above, marked the spot of a larger subterranean vault, whose door was

³⁶Kropper died 11 March, 1811, but the plot was purchased on 2 March, 1811. See Père Lachaise Archives.

³⁷See Arnaud, *Receuil*, Plan, p. 41 and Plate 21.

visible on the Roger illustration just in front of the monument. (ill. 195) In 1822 Marchant de Beaumont described the family as 'originating from Alsace and now greatly distinguished in big business in the capital' and the accompanying illustration of the tomb showed that it had been significantly enlarged into a rectangular shaped mausoleum built into the terrace behind it, with a rusticated facade, a doorway closed off by an iron gate, and the original monument used as a decorative element on top.³⁸ (ill. 196) The transformation of the original monument into a larger mausoleum, of greater status as a dwelling-like structure, may indeed have been the result of the Soëhnée family's rise into the *moyenne* or even *haute bourgeoisie* of big business since their arrival in the capital or it may simply have been necessitated by the incorporation of other members of the Müller family, and a general Berckheim and his daughter. However, it may be equally significant that the Soëhnée, Müller and Berckheim family were immigrants, which brings us to the second aspect of Daumard's assertion about rural and working class immigrants achieving greater socio-economic status in the capital, which is, that it is quite possible to see the establishment of family tombs by these individuals as an achievement of another kind of status, namely of having become Parisians.

According to the nineteenth-century statistician Bertillon, in 1833 only fifty percent of the people who died in Paris had actually been born there. Migration was not limited to the working classes or

³⁸'...familles Müller et Soëhnée, originaires de l'Alsace, et maintenant fort distinguées dans le haut commerce de la capitale.' François-Marie Marchant de Beaumont, *Vues pittoresques, historiques et morales du Cimetière du Père-Lachaise, représentant ses aspects, ses sites, ses points de vues, les plus magnifiques, les scènes les plus touchantes...*, Paris, 1822, p. 177

peasants but included a large number of middle and upper class families as well from the provinces and even abroad.³⁹ Provincialness however carried a great deal of stigma. Thanks to a rigid centralization of government, Paris had been transformed not only into the political epicentre of the nation, but also an intellectual and financial one, far beyond any other city in France. Popular novels, such as those of Balzac, commonly depicted provincial towns and cities as stagnant and stifling in comparison to the glitter of the capital.⁴⁰ The same is true of Stendhal in *Le Rouge et le noir*, where the society Julien encounters in the capital at the Marquis de la Mole's comes across as cultured, scintillating and witty, while in contrast the elite of the town of Verrières in the Franche-Comté region are clumsy and ridiculous and forever banished by the author as being 'plus paysans que bourgeois'.⁴¹ A quick perusal of the birthplaces of many of the bourgeois family mausoleums of the period, large and small, certainly indicate migration from the provinces to the capital and the establishment of monumental family tombs in one of the most frequented open spaces of Paris may have been a means of eradicating the stigma of provincialness, functioning as a symbolic foundation of roots, a demonstration of belonging, of trading their status as outsiders and country bumpkins for that of cultured Parisians.

If we return to the mimetic relationship between the family dwelling and the mausoleum, yet another similarity becomes apparent

³⁹Bertillon, cited in Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, Paris, 1955 (1974 ed.); p. 237. According to Daumard, due to a poor birth rate amongst the elite classes of the capital, it was only due to an influx of wealthy people from the provinces that assured the renewal and perpetuation of the capital's upper class society. Daumard, *La Bourgeoisie*, 1963, p. 230

⁴⁰Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration*, pp. 257 and 264-265

⁴¹Stendhal, *Le Rouge et le noir*, Paris, garnier-Flammarion edition, 1964, p. 33

by comparing these urban buildings to their cemetery counterparts, that is that location was of the greatest significance. At Père Lachaise a division is discernible between two types of sites chosen by families for their mausoleums: secluded wooded areas with abundant vegetation and prominent carriage ways or main avenues. In terms of the former category, the wooded groves of the cemetery seem to have had a particularly high cachet in the early years with certain families. As discussed in Chapter Two, these groves had been part of the original Jesuit estate and Brongniart had maintained and developed two in his design for the cemetery, which were to become known as Delille's Grove, situated just off and to the right of the central avenue that leads from the main entrance to the original site of the house, and the Dragoon's Grove, situated in the north-eastern part of the cemetery in a grove of lime trees.⁴² The natural setting and seclusion of these groves offered a picturesque setting for tombs, privacy, intimacy, a sense of solitude and an idyllic retreat for quiet, spiritual meditation. While Delille's grove was dominated by the Eighteenth Century's literary and artistic elite (see Chapter Two), the Dragoon's grove was quickly populated with a number of family tomb. (See Maps 1 and 2) In fact, the very first recorded purchase of a freehold plot in the cemetery was for a site in the grove, by the Jacquemart family, mentioned above, in 1804, for the establishment of their family mausoleum. Soon other families followed and by 1817, Arnaud's anthology of tombs cited the grove as containing 'the sepulchres of the Moreau, Brochant, Fieffé,

⁴²Arnaud describes it as a lime tree grove, *Plan du cimetière du Père la Chaise tel qu'il est actuellement, Octobre 1815*, vol. 1, *Receuil*, vol.1, 1817

Jacquemart and other families'.⁴³ In 1822 Marchant de Beaumont also described the Pénot-Lombard family tomb at the entrance of the grove and his map of 1824 further indicated the Bonnefoy, Blacque, Gauthier and Kropper families in the grove as well.⁴⁴

Despite the almost complete monopolization of Delille's grove by artistic and literary luminaries, initially, this grove too may have attracted the family. Arnaud records at least one family tomb there, that of Jean-Charles Deladreue, the grocer, mentioned above, who died in 1809, at a time when Brongniart's designs for the cemetery had in all likelihood not yet been elaborated and Delille was still alive.⁴⁵ In addition another area in the cemetery seems to support this notion that these romantic wooded sites held great appeal for families desirous of establishing tombs and mausoleums. Just above what was once an ornamental lake, now dried out, was what Arnaud described as a 'small wood of fully-grown trees or of the *Fidèle* (the name of the fountain in a corner of this wood) which has a spiritual character. This small wood is remarkable in that it has some large tombs erected over vaults including those of the Soëhnée and Clary families, that of the countess de la Marck among others'.⁴⁶ Marchant de Beaumont's map of 1824 also indicated the tomb of the family of General Junot, Duc d'Abrantès

⁴³All of these families are mentioned in the first volume published in 1817. Their tombs are listed as being in the grove on the Map. Arnaud, *Receuil*, vol. 1, 1817.

⁴⁴Marchant de Beaumont, *L'Observateur au Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1824

⁴⁵Arnaud, vol. 2, 1825, p. 33, Plate 57. Patrick Bracco dates Brongniart's two watercolour plans from the Musée Carnavalet around 1810. 'Le Père Lachaise', *Alexandre-Théodore Brongniart 1739-1813, Architecture et décor*, Paris, Musée Carnavalet, 1986, p. 295. This would seem logical as one of the plans contains a drawing of the Chapelle Greffuhle, and the other plan indicates its location with a red square. According to the Père Lachaise archives, this plot was only purchased by Louis Greffuhle 10 April, 1810.

⁴⁶Arnaud, *Receuil*, vol. 1, 1817, p. 83 and Map.

(d. 1813). These family mausoleums had already been established before Brongniart's plans for the cemetery called for the clearance of these woods and the lake.

For the most part, with the notable exception of the Clary's, these families were middle class in origin: grocers, merchants, manufacturers such as Kropper, artisans such as Gauthier, and professionals such as the notary Fieffé or Anne-Joseph Pénot-Lombard *commissaire-ordonnateur des guerres*, (essentially a budget controller). The scale of the monuments reflected these origins: of modest size and comprising mostly of simple headstones or medium sized sarcophagi over subterranean family vaults. Of all the bourgeois families in the groves, only the Soëhnée and Müller family erected a mausoleum. The minimum size of a plot in the cemetery was 2 metres large and 1 metre wide for the burial of an adult and the Kropper family purchased a plot only slightly larger than the minimum at 4 metres in 1810 and the Deladreue plot was 6 metres long.⁴⁷ In contrast, the plot purchased by the Soëhnée family in 1809 was larger at 16 meters, making room for a mausoleum, but even this was still relatively modest in comparison to purchases of wealthy families of the *haute bourgeoisie* for their lavish mausoleums, such as that of the Greffuhle family only a year earlier measuring 36 metres.⁴⁸

For some this predilection for the wooded, secluded groves for the establishment of family tombs might be interpreted as part of the general romantic sensibility that seemed part of the cemetery's appeal

⁴⁷Minimum size of plots, were, according to Article 4, Règlement générale des cimetières de la ville de Paris, Prefecture du Département de la Seine, 2 metres wide by 1 metre wide. Quoted in N. Richard, *Le Véritable conducteur au Père-Lachaise, Montrouge, Montparnasse et Vaugirard*, Paris, 1830, p. 19

⁴⁸Plot sizes given in Père Lachaise Archives.

during this period. After all, the virtues of meditation amongst the tombs and of the tomb in nature had been lauded by poets since the Eighteenth Century and continued well into the Nineteenth. While writing about Père Lachaise cemetery around 1854, B. Gastineau poked a great deal of fun at what he called Romanticism's funereal period, when romantic novels were filled with images of death and tombs and some writers like Frédéric Soulié made careers out of specializing in this funereal genre. Gastineau even recalled the days when he frequented a poet of the genre, who languished daily in the Parisian cemeteries.⁴⁹ Yet, it is also arguable that the preference for the wooded, secluded groves at Père Lachaise was a characteristic of a particular social and economic class.

During the first half of the century, there was a noticeable increase in consumer demand for encounters with and experiences of nature in a variety of forms, including landscape painting, prints and even spectacles like the diorama, which Nicolas Green has argued, coincided with the transformation of the capital into a modern, urban metropolis. This mass consumption of nature also incorporated the concept of the *maison de campagne*, a luxury previously limited to the very wealthy elite and consisting of large, elegant properties. Green quotes l'Hermite de la Chaussée d'Antin's quip that 'the meanest draper of the Rue Quincampoix, the most junior clerk in a minor branch of administration, wants to be able to say: *my countryside*!'.⁵⁰ For the *petite* and *moyenne bourgeoisie* this countryside was located quite

⁴⁹B. Gastineau, *Le Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1854, pp. 7-8

⁵⁰See Nicholas Green, *The Spectacle of Nature, Landscape and Bourgeois Culture in Nineteenth-century France*, Manchester and New York, 1990, pp. 84-89. Quote p. 85.

close to Paris and in effect often quite densely populated with bourgeois country houses, where nature was enjoyed in small, densely planted enclosed gardens rather than in vast unspoiled spaces. In 1843 Meynadier described the countryside surrounding Paris as a 'vast belt of districts linked to the walls of Paris [which] generally present a picture of highly-cultivated ground subdivided into thousands of tiny plots' with 'multitudes of small maisonnettes'.⁵¹ In many ways this description of the bourgeoisie's experience of nature was not vastly different to what could be found at Père Lachaise, also conveniently situated on the outskirts of Paris.

Not coincidentally, around 1854, Gastineau described Père Lachaise as a 'wooded hill where each proprietor has built their small country house, decorating it with the comforts and furnishings according to their taste...'.⁵² The purchase of a plot and the establishment of a family mausoleum in a secluded wood in the cemetery may have represented another commodity in the consumption of nature, an attempt to appropriate and experience, as with the country house, the landscape scene and the diorama, one's own countryside. In many ways, the family plots were transformed into miniature country retreats and rural gardens with the addition of trees, flowers and shrubs. For example, the Fieffé family planted four additional cypresses at each corner. The surrounding borders were decorated with plants that flowered throughout most of the year.⁵³ The Fieffé and Jacquemart families also added benches, for quiet

⁵¹Quoted in Nick Green, *The Spectacle of Nature*, 1990, p. 88

⁵²'On croirait être transportée sur une colline boisée où chaque propriétaire aurait fait bâtir sa petite maison de campagne, en l'ornant des agréments et des fournitures de son goût...' Gastineau, *Le Père Lachaise*, 1854, p. 17

⁵³Arnaud, *Receuil*, vol. 1, 1817, p. 43

lengthy contemplation.⁵⁴ The plots were often enclosed by surrounding railings and chains, almost in a parody of the walls surrounding, safeguarding the gardens of bourgeois country retreats.

Gastineau's description of the cemetery resembling a suburban sprawl of bourgeois country cottages is followed only three pages later by the statement that the 'cemetery of Père Lachaise exactly represents a city, with its opulent quarters and its miserable *faubourgs*, its magnificent buildings and its shacks, its large streets and its dark alleys, its rich and its poor...'⁵⁵ The comparison with the city was so often reiterated, that it almost seems like a cliché, but it is significant, in that it indicates yet another aspect of the importance of location in the cemetery. In relation to the family, while the wooded groves and copses attracted the *petite* and *moyenne* bourgeoisie, the family mausoleums of the *haute* bourgeoisie clustered close to the main avenues, along the wide streets, so to speak, rather than in dark alleys. Most conspicuous by their scale, lavishness and visibility were the large family mausoleums built along the circular carriage way leading from the Rond-Point, site of the Casimir Périer monument, up towards the northern part of the cemetery.

The Greffuhle family chapel was located along this stretch and its designer Brongniart had in fact singled the edifice out as an integral aspect of his plan for the cemetery. One of the architect's watercolour plans for the landscaping of the cemetery included eight illustrations of the principal edifices such as the entrance, main chapel and the monuments dedicated to illustrious figures discussed in Chapter Two

⁵⁴Arnaud, *Receuil*, vol.1, 1817, pp. 43 and 90

⁵⁵Gastineau, *Le Père Lachaise*, 1854, p. 20

and significantly, the Greffuhle chapel as well. (ill. 24) In doing so, Brongniart established the large scale family mausoleum or chapel as an essential characteristic of the cemetery, perhaps almost on an equal footing with the monuments dedicated to illustrious figures. Brongniart had planned to place the latter monuments at strategic intersections as focal points in the landscape of the cemetery, but the location of the Greffuhle chapel was of the same nature, located on the northern portion of the circular carriage way, at an intersection with a diagonal path leading back to the future site of the main chapel. With the example set by the designer of the cemetery himself, it is hardly surprising then that it was along the very same avenue that most of the largest mausoleums were erected over the following decades.

By 1830, following the main avenue from the Rond-Point towards the north-east revealed an impressive array of imposing family mausoleums, such as those of the Bancé aîné, Barry (ill. 197 and 198), Brailon, Contanceau, Desfammes, Délépine (ill. 200), Frochot, Goupy, Greffuhle, Hadengue-Regnault and Delafontaine, Houdaille (ill. 199), Kellerman, Lafitte, André Leroux, Lemaire, Lemoine, Millot, Otto, Perregaux, Poitevin, Teissier (ill. 198) and Trubert families.⁵⁶ As

⁵⁶The Rogers' map indicates the Délépine family tomb on the main circular carriageway. Roger, *Le Champs du Repos*, Paris, 1816, vol. 1, frontispiece. In addition, Arnaud's map indicates the tombs of Hector Lemaire, the Duchess de Valmy, the Lafitte, Millot and Desfammes families. Arnaud illustrated the impressive door of the Houdaille family mausoleum in *Receuil*, vol. 2, 1825. The map in Marty (1844) indicates it off the northern portion of the avenue, not far from Greffuhle. Marchant de Beaumont describes the Barry and Teissier family mausoleums built into the hill below Masséna and facing onto the carriage way. *Vues pittoresques, historiques et morales du Cimetière du Père-Lachaise*, Paris, 1822, p. 217. His 1824 map shows the Perregaux mausoleum at the intersection of the Avenue des Acacias and the Chemin des Anglais, where it can still be found today. Marchant de Beaumont, *L'Observateur au Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1824. His 1828 publication locates the tombs of the Trubert, Hadengue-Regnault, Delafontaine, Bancé aîné, Goupy, André Leroux, Contanceau, Lemoine, Brailon and Lafitte families on the Avenue. Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire*

discussed above the Greffuhle family were some of the largest landowners of their day, with their attachments to the Ancien Regime and in many ways they were much more representative of traditional sources of wealth, power in the past, but in contrast the majority of the other family mausoleums along the avenue illustrated recent transformations in the social hierarchy and the emergence of a new elite of families in early nineteenth-century France. There were still discrepancies in scale amongst the mausoleums along the avenue, some which were relatively modest, in comparison to the 36 metres of the Greffuhle plot, for example, such as that of the Desfammes family, constructed on the 9 metres purchased by Michel Desfammes in 1817. (ill. 197) Yet the latter's location on the southern loop of the circular avenue, on the flank of the hillock that came down from the General's Quarter to the Avenue, did make it possible to carve out a sizable vault into the rock.⁵⁷ The Délepine family, for example, managed to build a vault with 32 spaces into the flank of the hillock.⁵⁸ (ill. 200) Moreover, there is little doubt that in relation to the modest monuments of the *moyenne* or *petite* bourgeoisie of the groves, despite these discrepancies, almost all of these mausoleums were more impressive in scale; more appropriate for the families of the *haute* bourgeoisie that had erected them.

du curieux dans le cimetière du Père Lachaise, Paris, 1828, pp. 136-137. Marchant de Beaumont's 1824 map also included the Houdaille and Perregaux monuments on the avenue. Frochot died in 1828 and his lavish mausoleum was designed by Godde, decorated by Raggi and Plantar. *Monumens funéraires choisis dans les cimetières de Paris et des principales villes de France*, dessinés, gravés et publiés par Normand, Fils, Graveur et éditeur de l'Arc de Triomphe des Tuileries, érigé en 1806, sur les dessins de MM. Pericier et Fontaine, 27 planches avec descriptions de M. Brès, Paris, 1832, p. 4

⁵⁷Marchant de Beaumont, *Manuel et itinéraire du curieux dans le cimetière du Père Lachaise*, Paris, 1828, p. 221

⁵⁸Roger, *Le Champs du Repos*, Paris, 1816, vol. 1, p. 263, plate 14, no. 713.

According to Adeline Daumard, during this period, the *haute bourgeoisie* was comprised mostly of rich merchants, large manufacturers, important government officials, magistrates, officers and some professionals and many of these occupations were represented by the family mausoleums along the avenue, with officers such as Marshal Kellerman, Duke de Valmy, and Marshal Macdonald, duc de Tarente (1765-1840, ill. 201), important government officials such as the former Prefect of the Seine, Frochot (ill. 202), and the diplomat and former Minister of State, Louis Guillaume Otto, comte de Morly (ill. 203).⁵⁹ However, while this section of the bourgeoisie had risen to tremendous heights of power, wealth and influence, according to Stendahl 'the bankers are at the heart of the State. The bourgeoisie has replaced the faubourg Saint-Germain', bastion of Ancien Regime aristocratic values, 'and the bankers are the nobility of the bourgeois class.'⁶⁰ This *aristocratie financière* was also apparent along the avenue, represented by prominent banking families such as the Lafitte and Perregaux.⁶¹ The Perregaux mausoleum was one of the most imposing along the avenue, located at an important intersection of the Avenue des Acacias and the smaller Avenue des Anglais and was frequently reproduced in guidebooks, such as *Paris and its Environs* produced under the direction of A. Pugin in 1829.⁶² (ill. 204) Count

⁵⁹Adeline Daumard, *La Bourgeoisie parisienne de 1815 à 1848*, Paris, 1963, pp. 214-215

⁶⁰Stendhal quoted Theodore Zeldin, *France 1848-1945: Ambition and Love*, Oxford University Press, 1988, p.77

⁶¹According to Daumard, the top echelon of the haute bourgeoisie, this *aristocratie financière* was comprised mostly of bankers, rich capitalists and large scale *négociants*. Daumard, *La Bourgeoisie parisienne*, Paris, 1963, p. 214

⁶²*Paris and its Environs, Displayed in a Series of Picturesque Views from Original Drawings Taken expressively for this Work, Comprising Views on the seine, Churches, Palaces, Public Offices, Bridges, Aqueducts, Catacombs, Streets, Modern*

Alphonse-Claude-Charles-Bernardin Perregaux was born in Switzerland in 1750 and established a bank in Paris, was a Senator under Napoléon and the first Governor of the newly created Bank of France. He died in Paris in 1808.⁶³ Jacques Lafitte had at one time been Perregaux' associate but he represented the new breed of bankers, a self-made man, rising from notary clerk to banking magnate.⁶⁴ When the Lafitte brothers established their family mausoleum they chose the main avenue as well and the event was recorded by a plaque on the wall inside; 'This plot was acquired by Pierre Jacques Martin Lafitte and Jean Lafitte, brother who had this monument erected for the sepulchre of their family in 1817.' (ill. 205)

The rise of the family mausoleum at Père Lachaise during these years had important repercussions on the appearance and mood of the cemetery. The increasing number of mausoleums were largely responsible for the erosion of the more romantic, wooded and secluded aspects of the space, and the transformation of the cemetery into the miniature city it is today, already described by Gastineau in 1854 and many other visitors, thanks to the succession of 'buildings' which soon lined every avenue and path, as far as the eye could see. (ill. 206) Space became increasingly rare, but so important had the format of the mausoleum become, that some were even erected on the smallest spaces, as narrow as a single plot, such as the identical mausoleums of the Thirion and Maillard families, located along the circular carriage

Improvements, etc., vols. 1 and 2, Drawings under the direction of A. Pugin, Esq., Engravings executed under the superintendence of Mr. C. Heath, Topographical and historical descriptions by L. T. Ventouillac (in French and English), London, 1829 and Paris, 1829-1831, vol. 1.

⁶³Pierre Larousse, *Dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle*, vols 1-17, Paris, 1864-1886, vol. 12, 1874, p. 651

⁶⁴Zeldin, *Ambition and Love*, 1988, p. 82

way. The two families were related, Jean-Joseph Thirion - born in Metz in 1800 and died in Paris in 1850 - having been married to Hortense Maillard (1808-1849) and while at one time the desire to gather together the two branches of the family might have elicited an enclosure with assorted monuments, the importance of the mausoleum dictated not one, but two such edifices, no matter how ridiculously narrow in proportion in relation to their height. (ill. 207)

While this study of family tombs at Père Lachaise may have raised as many questions as it proposes to answer, a truly in-depth study might entail the resources of a genealogist which is beyond the scope of this project. However, despite the many questions that remain for further analysis, it has been possible to argue a link between the motivation for, the style and location of these so-called private family monuments and socio-economic and political transformations in the capital. From the post-revolutionary perception of the family tomb as the expression of social and political stability, the family mausoleum developed into an expression of social and economic identity, especially for a bourgeoisie in search of its own forums of expression, and as a result, it is possible to discern at Père Lachaise quite a number of the permutations that were taking place in the city visible from the heights of the cemetery.

In the process of my research on Parisian funerary and urban monuments of the Nineteenth Century it became clear that the particular relationship between the two that had evolved after the opening of Père Lachaise in 1804 was altered sometime around mid-century by a combination of factors and events. The importance of the role played by Père Lachaise in the first half of the century had no doubt already been tempered by the opening of the cemeteries of Montmartre in 1824 and Montparnasse in 1825. Until this time Père Lachaise had remained the only cemetery offering the coveted *concession perpétuelle*, or freehold plot, yet, despite the availability of freehold plots in the new cemeteries, Père Lachaise still seems to have remained a staunch favourite, necessitating enlargement no less than six times between 1824 and 1850.¹

After 1850 however, the conjunction of a number of events and circumstances seemed to conspire to wrest away some of the pre-eminent position of Père Lachaise as *the* guardian of the capital's - perhaps even the nation's - collective memory. To attempt to ascribe an exact date for such a progressive transformation is a near impossible task. However, for the sake of clarity, it seemed that the event that had the most influence on the status and significance of Père Lachaise was the introduction of the commemoration of non-royal, ordinary individuals in the urban landscape of the capital. In many ways the inauguration of the monument to Marshal Ney in 1853 can be perceived as ushering in radically new commemorative practices, the 'statuemanía', of the second half of the century and thus seemed appropriate as the acme of the period of Père Lachaise's influence. As

¹Jacques Hillairet, *Les Deux-cent cimetières du vieux Paris*, Paris, 1958, p. 323

a means of immortalizing the nation's illustrious and preserving them in the collective memory, the monuments which soon filled every square, street corner and park in the capital, must have seemed more conspicuous and prestigious than a tomb in a cemetery on the outskirts of the city.

On the heels of these developments, new legislation was introduced in 1859 assigning burial in Parisian cemeteries according to the *arrondissement* one resided in. While there must have still been many ways for circumventing these restrictions, the new regulations ushered in the transformation of Père Lachaise from *the* Parisian cemetery into more of a neighbourhood cemetery, servicing the 3rd, 4th, 9th, 12th and 20th *arrondissements* mainly situated on the eastern side of the city.² As a result, a greater number of tombs than ever were automatically channelled to other Parisian cemeteries, and, Montmartre and Montparnasse in particular were fast becoming famous for their increasing number of notable, illustrious and infamous tombs.

Père Lachaise continued to be an important site for dissident expression which was still denied the urban forum, with monuments such as that of the journalist Victor Noir, murdered by Prince Bonaparte in 1870 and discussed in Chapter Four, but here as well, Père Lachaise was encountering increasingly stiff competition from the other Parisian cemeteries. François Rude's monument to the staunch republican and anti-Orleanist Godefroy Cavaignac (also discussed in Chapter Four), was inaugurated in 1856 at Montmartre cemetery as

²Pierre Larousse, *Dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle*, vols. 1-17, Paris, 1864-1886, vol. 4, 1869, p. 301

would be the monument to deputy Alphonse Baudin, killed while defending the Republic against Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte on the barricades in 1851.³

At the same time as the cemetery's monopoly on immortalizing the capital's illustrious and popularity as a site for displaying political, social and economic identities were being usurped by urban sites and other Parisian cemeteries, the very physical characteristics that had once made the space so attractive, namely the verdant, garden landscape, were likewise slowly being eroded. The newer additions to the cemetery lacked the whimsical charm of the winding paths Brongniart had grafted onto the former Jesuit estate, being largely laid out in a grid pattern. Père Lachaise increasingly lost its apparent difference and distance from the city and began more and more to resemble the urban sprawl below, with its densely packed mausoleums (ill. 206) and in 1860, the annexation of areas surrounding the city brought the cemetery within the city limits.⁴ As a result, without its appealing natural, verdant landscape there was increasingly less to differentiate Père Lachaise from the other burial grounds of the capital.

Though it is clear that the amalgamation of these circumstances and events had a great effect on the status of the cemetery and its relationship with the capital, there is still a danger in trying to impose specific and at times artificial temporal limits on such a vast subject

³A subscription for the latter was launched in 1868 and intended as a critique of the Empire, but the organizers were tried and convicted for their seditious activities and the project was banned until the fall of the regime. The monument by Aimé Millet (1819-1891) depicting the fallen deputy as a *gisant* in modern garb was inaugurated shortly thereafter in 1872. See Antoinette Le Normand-Romain, "'En hommage aux opposants politiques', Monument funéraire ou publique?", *Revue de l'Art*, No. 94, 1991, p. 76

⁴Richard Etlin, *The Architecture of Death, The Transformation of the Cemetery in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1984, p. 368

matter, for in many ways the dialectic between city and cemetery also remained persistently unaltered after mid-century. For example, despite the availability of urban spaces for official commemorative projects, when Adolphe Thiers died in 1877, those who sought to immortalize him nonetheless looked once again to Père Lachaise.⁵ At the end of the century, the cemetery could still be perceived as the appropriate forum for official propaganda, just as it had been when the Casimir Périer monument was erected. Nearly a hundred years later, it also remained the appropriate site for dissident expression as well, when in 1971, the very same mausoleum was damaged by plastic explosives and covered in expletory graffiti by political activists demonstrating against the right wing principles they perceived Thiers as embodying.⁶

While the political, social and economic importance of funerary monuments during the first half of the Nineteenth Century became apparent in other areas of France as well, it is worth noting that in many ways the dialogue between city and cemetery outlined in this work was something quite unique and perhaps even essential to the capital. By the 1860's the now overcrowded cemeteries of Paris, which had since been assimilated within the confines of the city limits, seemed to threaten the safety of the city's drinking water. The Prefect Haussmann proposed their closure and removal to a site at Méry-sur-Oise, far removed from the capital, but Parisians simply refused to be separated from their cemeteries and the proposal met with such staunch opposition that it was dropped, as was the similar proposal by

⁵See Chapter Five, p. 243-244

⁶Michel Dansel, *Les Cimetières de Paris, Promenade insolite, pittoresque et capricieuse*, Paris, 1987, pp.64-65

Prefect Duval in the 1880's.⁷ The reaction of the citizens of Paris is perhaps the best illustration of the significance of the relationship between the city and the cemetery that had developed since the beginning of the century and one that would seem to corroborate the hypothesis put forth at the very beginning of this study, namely that Père Lachaise in particular was much more than simply a passive, reflective mirror to the capital, but an active, creative participant in its evolution and identity.

⁷Etlin, *The Architecture of Death*, 1984, p. 368